

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 11, 1985

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We remember, O God, those people whose good deeds and service to others are known only to the few but whose acts of charity are motivated by genuine compassion and concern. In Your divine understanding, gracious God, we acknowledge that You encourage us to do justice not so our names will be known, but rather that healing and righteousness will take place. In the silence of our own hearts we honor those saints, whose names are known to You, for their good works and for their devotion to making our homes and communities places of peace and good will. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerk's, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) "Joint resolution to designate the week of November 24 through November 30, 1985, as 'National Family Week'."

## THE REPUBLICANS' \$2 TRILLION DEBT

(Mr. COELHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, U.S. News & World Report, a magazine not known for its liberalism, points out this week that before the Republicans took over in 1981, our Nation's entire 205-year history had produced a \$1 trillion debt.

But later this month, in 1985, President Reagan is going to ask Congress to approve a \$2 trillion debt. That's right, after campaigning in 1980 on a platform of fiscal responsibility, the Republicans started buying \$600 toilet seats and allowing the rich corporations to pay no taxes. The result? A \$2 trillion debt that America's young people will have to pay.

There's even an excellent chart here to illustrate how the Republicans have doubled the debt in 5 short years.

How much is 2 trillion? U.S. News says that "2 trillion \$1 bills placed end-to-end would stretch 186 million miles—from the Earth to the Sun and back."

That's a pretty long way, Mr. Speaker, but not nearly as far as the Republicans and their corporate welfare queens will have to go in explaining this one to the voters in 1986.

## OFFSHORE OIL EXPLORATION NEGOTIATIONS

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, talks broke down between Secretary Hodel and the California Members—after 6 weeks of difficult and often controversial negotiations on offshore oil exploration. The Members left the room angry and disappointed.

The dispute centered around a preliminary agreement negotiated last July. It called for leasing 150 tracts off of California. Secretary Hodel claimed the tracts offered very low potential, and thus are worthless to the oil industry. He wants better tracts.

The majority of the California delegation wants the Secretary to honor the preliminary agreement. Neither side was in the mood to budge and the agreement fell apart.

Now that the heat of yesterday has subsided, cooler heads must prevail. We are all responsible legislators and the long-term need for agreement still exists.

I call on Mr. Hodel to present immediately what he wants and for the California delegation to return to the bargaining table. In the meantime, the moratorium ought to be extended until consensus is reached.

## ADMINISTRATION SHOULD BE WORKING ON SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES IN GENEVA

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President told the visiting Danish Prime Minister that the upcoming summit should be a "starting point for better relations—a starting point for progress." No one could disagree with that. But the other things this administration has been saying

raise doubt about whether they are interested in a meeting of substance.

Every day, it seems, we are warned not to expect much from Geneva. The State Department never mentions the summit without cautioning against optimism in the same breath. Yesterday, the President himself made a point of minimizing hopes.

If this is the subtle and delicate language of diplomacy, fine. But my worry is that both sides are becoming more concerned with public relations than with the substantive issue, which is nothing less than human survival.

Our statements and actions should make that clear. As the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL] has suggested, we should be working on the "essential elements" of an arms control agreement with the Soviets. I hope the President will do just that.

## THE KIDNAPING OF PRESIDENT DUARTE'S DAUGHTER

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I and I am sure all of my colleagues were shocked and saddened to hear about the kidnaping of President Jose Napoleon Duarte's daughter yesterday in El Salvador. We do not know who did it, but we know that whoever did, is despicable and has committed an extreme act of terrorism which we all condemn.

I am sure all of my colleagues join me in extending our sympathy and best wishes and hopes for the recovery of Jose Napoleon Duarte's daughter unharmed.

When President Duarte was here a little over a year ago, he told us that he was willing to endure anything including risking his own life, for democracy in El Salvador. What happened yesterday shows that indeed that is what can happen when you take the kind of risks that he has taken.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in extending sympathy and best wishes to him, and for continued wishes for success in a very difficult job.

## HON. SONNY MONTGOMERY RECIPIENT OF THE MENDEL RIVERS' AWARD OF EXCELLENCE

(Mr. NICHOLS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I know our colleagues would be interested to know that our distinguished colleague from Mississippi, the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, had been named by the Noncommissioned Officers' Association as the 1985 recipient of the prestigious Mendel Rivers' Award of Excellence.

This award is made annually honoring a Member for his service in behalf of the men and women in our military service, and certainly our friend from Mississippi, the very able chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, is most deserving of this honor.

During Sonny's 19 years of dedicated service in the Congress, he has been a strong champion of providing educational opportunities for men and women in the military service, and his efforts in this field have been very helpful to recruitment and retention in all branches of the service.

Sonny's long time concern for our missing in action in Vietnam and Indochina, together with his dedication supporting our National Guard and Reserve forces, entitles him to receive this outstanding award, and I know his many friends on the floor of the House want to join me in extending our sincere congratulations.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

□ 1210

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, this is a terribly important statement the gentleman from Alabama is making, because it tells us something about a man who has done so well in his life in so many fields. And yet he takes the time to do the little things that affect so dramatically our enlisted personnel in the service. This is a trait that more of us ought to have. I wish I had more of it. The finest thing you can say about SONNY MONTGOMERY, particularly in the South, is that he is a true southern gentleman. He looks like a Congressman, he acts like a Congressman, and he is a credit to the body.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

#### CONRAIL

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the question recurs: What should the U.S. Congress do about Conrail?

The administration proposes, pursuant to its duty, to sell the system to Norfolk, an existing railway system, for \$1.2 billion.

There are many of us who can prove conclusively that that is a very inex-

pensive price to place upon such a worthy asset. We prefer, many of us—and we wish we could impress our colleagues to the same extent—that the system ought to be put up for a public offering. This would have two guaranteed elements: First, it would produce, without question, more than the \$1.2 billion now in the picture, and thus would help our revenue picture just that much more; and second, it would guarantee the continued existence of Conrail and its management as we now know it, which we know is a profitable, workmanlike operation in its present circumstance.

That is why I am asking all of the Members to look very closely at the proposed sale as now constituted. We owe our taxpayers more than just the automatic adoption of the sale to Norfolk.

#### THE NATIONAL DEBT

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California started out this morning by talking about the national debt, how the President has now asked us to double it. Reagan started with a \$1 trillion debt and now he's driven it to \$2 trillion.

I think it is very important to break the debt down even further and show what this means to every individual American. What this means is every American today portion of the debt is \$7,736 per every man, woman, and child.

As we go around, crowing about our wonderful gross national product, let us not forget that 50 percent of that gross national product is on the cuff, it is because of this debt, whereas in 1981, when the administration took over, the debt was 34 percent of the GNP. That is a phenomenal increase.

But the projections as to what we are going to have to pay in interest on this national debt are phenomenal, \$138 billion in interest payments will be required next year.

Somebody is going to have to pay. The debt is going to come due eventually. And I think it is incredible that a President that campaigned saying that they were really fiscally responsible have turned out to be the most fiscally irresponsible in the history of the country.

#### THE KIDNAPING OF INES GUADELUPE DUARTE DURAN

(Mr. BARNES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I am about to introduce a resolution condemning the kidnaping of Ines Guade-

lupe Duarte Duran, the daughter of the President of El Salvador, Jose Napoleon Duarte. This is an outrageous act. As was said by my friend and colleague from California just a few minutes ago, we have no idea who did it, but whoever did it has engaged in a dispicable action that cannot be justified in any way, under any circumstances.

At 2 o'clock this afternoon I will convene a meeting of the subcommittee that I have the privilege to chair, the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs. I hope that we will unanimously report out the resolution that my friend from California, the ranking Republican, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, has agreed to cosponsor. We hope to move this resolution quickly on a bipartisan basis. I know that all Democrats and all Republicans will want to join us in calling upon those responsible for this kidnaping to release the President's daughter unharmed and to desist in engaging in this kind of reprehensible action.

#### SAY IT AIN'T SO

(Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, without in any way diminishing the problems of trade, unemployment or the debt, this today is a brief cry for something I do not even believe the Congress can solve.

Last night I watched, again, baseball players, who have been giving evidence and therefore are free from prosecution, about dealing with and taking drugs. None of these players exhibited much remorse, nor have I heard from baseball owners that they would somehow unite to make sure this cannot happen again, nor from the players' organization. This kind of thing has got to stop. We are not talking about poor farm boys or ghetto youths who are unemployed. We are talking about people who make \$300,000 a year, who, for our children, are the models and examples.

Can you imagine my hero, Stan Musial, shooting it up, or maybe Bob Gibson saying, "It was a tough day, therefore I am going to take some pills."

In 1919, a little kid said, "Say it ain't so, Joe." I can only ask today the baseball teams again: Please say it won't be so.

#### UNFAIR FOREIGN TRADE PRACTICES

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)



Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, like the historic figure of Emperor Nero fiddling away while Rome burned, the United States is still fiddling around the edges of a problem which burns at the very heart of the American economic base. Unfair foreign trade practices combine with an administration policy of ignoring those inequities to daily rob Americans of jobs and erode the mining and manufacturing base of the Nation. Our policy seems to be to promote mining and manufacturing jobs everywhere except here on good U.S. soil.

Mr. Speaker, there is a broad gulf-wide difference between protectionism and trade reciprocity. Protectionism implies the artificial support of inefficient operations. Trade reciprocity implies equal and fair treatment of products on the international market.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the United States to tell our major trading partners that we will no longer tolerate imbalances in trade restrictions, tariffs, and quotas, that we are prepared to match them item by item, commodity by commodity, until everyone comes to their senses and balance is restored.

Only then will we have real and free and fair trade. And in that kind of economic environment, Americans can compete against anyone in the world.

#### NEVER MIND THE PROBLEMS WITH CHEMICAL WEAPONS

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this House will soon face another vote on chemical weapons.

Two months ago, the House tentatively approved the production of new nerve gas weapons with two important conditions: First, that a 2-year deadline be set to give the arms control negotiations in Geneva a chance; and second, that we borrow the estimated \$20 billion that new nerve gas weapons will cost if our closest NATO allies agree to accept them.

As I predicted at that time, the conference stripped those important conditions from the House bill and left a naked commitment to nerve gas.

Never mind that without our allies' approval, these weapons will not get within 3,000 miles of where they would be needed. Never mind the \$20 billion added to the deficit. Never mind three GAO reports stating that the weapons proposed are not ready for production.

The GAO says they won't work, our allies say they won't deploy them, and I say we cannot afford them. Let's reject the conference's open endorsement of chemical weapons.

#### OPERATION TIGER: A TRIBUTE

(Mrs. BYRON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to 749 American soldiers who lost their lives during Exercise Tiger, a secret preparatory operation for the Normandy invasion during World War II.

During this operation, the U.S. 4th Infantry Division losses were numbered at approximately 749 men and many more were wounded.

The Allied Military Command did little to recognize those individuals who participated. Few people have heard of this tragedy some 41 years later.

Mr. Speaker, a memorial was recently erected to honor these men who lost their lives in the line of duty. The memorial, which stands in Torcross, was not established by a military authority, but by a distinguished gentleman from England. Yesterday I had the privilege of meeting this gentleman. Mr. Ken Small of Torcross in Devon County, England, pursued, at his own expense, the idea of establishing a memorial for over 10 years. On November 9, 1984, Mr. Small's dream became a reality. On that day his memorial to those who served in the operation was dedicated.

I, personally, am proud of Mr. Small's actions and hope others will recognize his efforts to pay tribute to those who served in Operation Tiger, those fallen soliders.

#### SERVITE ORDER MARKS 700TH ANNIVERSARY; SERVITE FATHER LAWRENCE JENCO HELD HOSTAGE IN LEBANON

(Mr. O'BRIEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 25, members of the Order of Servants of Mary in the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago met to celebrate the 700th anniversary of the death of St. Philip Benizi, an early leader of the order, known as Servites.

The Servites have been in the Chicago area for 111 years. The order has 10 religious communities in the Chicago Archdiocese and staffs 7 parishes.

Conspicuously absent from the celebrations was Father Lawrence Jenco, a Servite priest from Joliet, IL. Father Jenco has been held hostage in Lebanon since January 8, 247 days. Not a missionary nor an evangelist, Father Jenco was the head of Catholic Relief Services in Beirut when he was kidnapped. To get his help there was only one qualification—that you be in need of help.

Today also marks the 544th day of captivity for William Buckley, a U.S. Foreign Service officer.

Rev. Benjamin Weir, a Presbyterian minister, has been held hostage in Lebanon for 491 days.

Terry Anderson, the Associated Press bureau chief in Beirut, was kidnapped March 16, 179 days ago.

Today is the 106th day of captivity for David Jacobsen, the director of the American University Hospital in Beirut.

Today is the 93d day of captivity of Thomas Sutherland, dean of the American University Agriculture School.

Today also marks the 281st day since the disappearance of Peter Kilburn, the American University librarian.

Mr. Speaker, the hostage crisis in Lebanon continues.

#### AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

(Mr. FAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the ranches and growers of our country are on the ropes. The farm economy is in shambles; the deficit has driven the dollar so high that the most efficient producer in the world, the American farmer, has been driven from world markets and into foreclosure.

If any situation demands leadership, the exercise of the bully pulpit, the President's attention and his concern, it would be the condition of American agriculture.

And what does our President engage his advisers' valuable time? And how are the unique and irreplaceable leadership qualities of the Presidency brought to bear on this crisis? The answer can be found on the pages of the style section of the Washington Post. In those pages, I learned that Patrick Buchanan has spent his valuable time arranging an Amtrak train to carry Merle Haggard and his band from Bakersfield, CA, to Illinois.

Now, I am not a cynic. I believe that Merle and Willie Nelson and Neil Young, and other country stars, are properly trying to highlight our greatest domestic crisis. But let us get the President and his hired sages working on farm policy. Time is short, Mr. Speaker, and the President should set Mr. Buchanan to work today on a speech on agricultural policy that will point the way out of this morass rather than having him acting as a train ticket agent on a rail passenger system he has tried to terminate.

We can all enjoy the music when this administration decides that it has a governmental role to play other than associating itself with good causes.

## IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Judiciary Committee began hearings again on the issue of immigration reform, and again the legislation it is considering, H.R. 3080, includes amnesty for illegal aliens. There is no doubt that the American people want immigration reform and there is no doubt they want to see an end to the problem of illegal immigration. But there is one more important thing, Mr. Speaker, the American people do not want amnesty for illegal aliens or any law-breakers. For those Members of this body that can't bring themselves to supporting H.R. 3080, there is an alternative, H.R. 2267, a bill I introduced in April of this year. This legislation does not contain amnesty for illegal aliens, but does include substantial increases in manpower for the INS and employer sanctions. I invite my colleagues to take a close look at H.R. 2267. It is time to regain control of America's borders.

□ 1225

## WE MUST MAINTAIN A NETWORK OF AMERICAN FAMILY FARMS

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this week about 150 North Dakotans came to Washington, DC. They met with many Members of the House and Senate and visited with the Speaker of the House to talk about the farm problem that is creating chaos in the central part of our country.

One of them, a friend of mine, a farmer and a State legislator, Representative Allen Richards, left something with us and I read it last evening. I wanted to share a couple of paragraphs with the House because it describes in real terms what is going on out in the country. He talks about the economic devastation out in rural America. He says:

In my township, in 1980, there were 12 farmers; now there are 7. Only one retired. On the main street of my hometown, which has 1,000 people, there are 4 businesses which have closed in the last 4 years, and 3 more are on the brink.

My legislative district has 25 townships and 5 communities. Five years ago, there were 4 new car dealers; now there are 3. Five years ago, there were 4 farm tractor dealers; now there are 2. Five years ago, there were nearly 20 percent more farmers than there are today, and in 1986 there will be 10 percent less than there are today.

The point of all of this is that he says, the group that came from North

Dakota says, quite appropriately, "This country had better start developing a policy that many of our allies have already developed. A policy that says it is important for this country's future to maintain a network of family farms." Our farm program does not now have that policy, and we had better get about the business of developing it. We can do it without spending a great deal of money if we spend that money the right way.

## IN TRIBUTE TO JUDGE VELDE

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of our August recess—as a matter of fact, on September 1—a former distinguished Member of this body passed away. He happened to be my predecessor in the Congress, Judge Harold Velde, who served during the 81st, 82d, 83d, and 84th Congresses. It was Judge Velde who gave me my start in politics because my first position here in Washington was serving as his administrative assistant.

I was asked by the family then, for memorial services held in Pekin, IL, last Saturday, to deliver a eulogy. Mr. Speaker, I include the text of that eulogy for the RECORD. Thank you.

## EULOGY OF HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

Dolores, Pete, Joyce, Joan and Jim, I'm deeply touched and honored that you asked me to deliver a eulogy for your husband and father, Judge Velde.

Aside from my parents and wife, no one has played a more pivotal role in my life than the Judge, for it was he who gave me my start in politics 37 years ago.

Dolores, I suspect you may recall as I do very vividly the first time I met the Judge, because you were the Court reporter then and participated in the interview that led to my being hired, fresh out of Bradley, as a sort of "Boy Friday" or general handy man for the Judge's first general election campaign.

At the conclusion of the interview, the Judge seemed to be favorably disposed and said: "We're running our campaign on a shoestring and we can't pay you very much, but if you do a good job and I get elected, you may want to think about coming along to Washington and we can talk again about the pay."

Then in a very apologetic way, he said: "But as for now we can only pay you \$30 a week."

Well, needless to say, we saw more in the association and the opportunity than in the salary. We shook hands and that was the beginning of what would become a very close relationship, kinship and friendship.

I also got to know Pete and Joan, who were just teenagers then and their mother, Olive, with whom I had to go over the mail and check the scheduling. It was a family affair. As a matter of fact when the Judge and I first went to Washington, we actually shared an apartment with our wives.

For the record, we could never forget the Judge's birthday, because it fell on April

Fool's Day, and we would always make the most of that. He was a Tazewell County boy all the way and liked to talk about his early years in Manito and Sand Prairie Township.

Those were his formative years and they had a great deal to do with his makeup as a man.

We often compared notes about our respective years at Bradley University. From there he went on to graduate from Northwestern and then Law School at the University of Illinois.

The Judge began the practice of law right here in Pekin. During World War II he served in the Army Signal Corps before being tabbed for service as a special agent with the FBI.

It was his counter-intelligence work with the FBI that alerted him to the depth and magnitude of the Communist Conspiracy in our country at the time. The built-up frustrations of observing and reporting first hand knowledge to his superiors of what was really going on and seeing so little done about it would later be one of the compelling reasons for his running for Congress.

Between his service in the FBI and the U.S. House of Representatives he was elected Tazewell County judge and I know he really enjoyed sitting as a judge, for he loved the law.

When the late Everett Dirksen decided against running for reelection to the Congress, it was a natural for Judge Velde to make the race. First a spirited Primary and then a successful fall election.

It was during the next 8 years as the Judge's Administrative Assistant that I got to know him so well and learned so much.

He was a delight to work for. He had a great sense of humor. He worked long hours, but he also knew when it was time to hang it up—take a break—and have a little fun.

He was a bonafide conservative Republican in his politics. It was natural, therefore, that his best friends in the Congress on both sides of the aisle were of similar persuasion. He carried no brief for screaming liberals and they were usually his most caustic critics.

The Judge was indeed at times a very controversial figure during his tenure in the House. And he was that because there were controversial issues at stake.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act was a red-hot issue at the time and one of the Judge's Committee assignments was the Education and Labor Committee, that dealt with it.

The Korean War was going on and the firing of General MacArthur provoked the greatest volume of mail we ever received.

The Judge had a meteoric rise in seniority on his House Committee on Un-American Activities, being elevated to the Chairmanship in only his second term. That was unprecedented!

It was on that Committee with the advent of televised coverage of committee hearings and the tenor of the times that made Judge Velde a national figure.

He didn't crave the spotlight. He just had a nasty job to do and it had to be done. The pressures and tensions of his job at the time were awesome. Yet, he acquitted himself so well with his mild mannered demeanor and judicial temperament.

There's no question in my mind that with all that he had to endure in those hectic days, it was taking its toll and certainly was a factor in his decision not to seek reelection after completing his fourth term.



Judge Velde went to Congress with a specific goal in mind—to expose to public view and attention what he rightly perceived as a clear and present danger to the security of our country. He played a very vital role at a critical time in our history.

We all should be grateful for what he did in his time to make this a better country. His was indeed distinguished service to the Republic. And when he retired voluntarily from the Congress, he went back to practicing law for another twenty years.

When he really retired he became all that much more active in his church and in Sun City, Arizona politics. He also served on the White House Conference on Aging.

As a matter of fact, his own Congressman, Eldon Rudd, told me Thursday on the House Floor that the Judge's precinct had the highest percentage of voter turnout in the State of Arizona in the last several elections.

Dolores, Pete, Joan, members of the family.

We've traversed very briefly with a lot of gaps the life of the Judge—who was a loving, devoted, strong, but gentle, good natured, wonderful husband, Dad, grandfather, dear friend to all of us and much, much more to some of us.

It's a sorrowful time for us because we all loved the Judge and we know he loved us. 75 years in this day and age is too young to die, particularly when one is so sound of mind and physically fit for his years as the Judge was, but we can never tell what the Lord's plan is for any one of us.

We do know that Hal, Harold Judge Velde lived those 75 years to the fullest. He always gave a full measure to his family, to his friends, to his community, and to his country.

Judge, we now say our farewell, grateful that you were so much a part of our lives. That will always be a cherished memory for each and every one of us.

#### NOW, MORE THAN EVER, WE NEED A STRONG SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

(Mr. LEHMAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's farm credit system is on the verge of total collapse. The reason is simple: Farm income is not sufficient to permit farmers to pay their debts. In many commodities, farm prices are significantly below the cost of production, leaving farmers with little to live on and nothing with which to pay their bills.

This crisis can no longer be considered temporary or cyclical. It is chronic and systemic, and will be terminal unless properly treated. We need a trade policy that looks out for our interests. The Reagan administration has adopted a policy of unilateral disarmament in trade. We need a credit structure sensitive and flexible enough to recognize the difference between a farmer struggling through an economic crisis and a common deadbeat who willingly walks away from his bills.

Now, more than ever, we need a strong Secretary of Agriculture who is bold and imaginative and vocal and willing to make policy instead of excuses.

#### SUPPLY SIDE SUFFER

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the statistics which pat the administration on the back because the poverty level is down, but the President cannot claim credit for this. It is the House Members who stood up for Social Security COLA's and rescued this country's seniors from poverty which accounts for the reduction that is really not actually true.

Figures just announced by the Census Bureau show that the poorest 40 percent of all families enjoy just 15 percent of all income. The richest 20 percent of all families enjoy 43 percent of all income. The rich get richer, the poor get poorer, and we have a new economic theory in America: It is called Supply Side Suffer.

We have an administration which merely slaps on the wrist E.F. Hutton officials for perpetrating a major fraud on the American people, but is content to watch the farmer and people lose their jobs and homes by practicing ineffective trade policies. We have yet to attack poverty and unemployment. There are at this point 3.3 million more poor children in America than there were a short 6 years ago. So today, my colleagues, I would like to give my own definition of the economic practices of America. They are called Supply Side Suffer.

#### THE BEHAVIOR OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT DOES NOT WARRANT A WEAKENING OF SANCTIONS

(Mr. FRANK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I have been puzzled that some people have seen a question of partisanship in the generally negative approach many of us have had to the President's effort to preempt the statutory enactment of sanctions by his own action. In the first place, the President's sanctions are, in some significant areas, weaker than those that are pending before the Congress. Many of us do not feel that the recent behavior of the South African Government is such that it should be rewarded by a weakening of sanctions.

But there is a broader institutional issue at stake as well. Traditionally, Presidents of the United States, out of a respect for democracy and the insti-

tutional strength of this country have sought to get joint legislative executive alignment behind important foreign policy arguments. Presidents of both parties have sought to do that.

Here we have the extraordinary spectacle of a President saying to a Congress, instead of us joining together so that both of the elected branches are united here, I will act unilaterally and keep you from acting. That is a reversal of what we have traditionally held to be the best way to present a united picture of America.

#### LET US NOT FAIL THE HOSTAGE FAMILIES IN THIS MOMENT OF NEED

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to call the attention of our colleagues to the plight of seven Americans who have for so long been held hostages in Lebanon.

Now, more than ever, the families of these hostages are working together, sharing their efforts and their energies to explore every possible hope of ending this said captivity.

I urge my colleagues to join in this effort. I am convinced that if the full influence and prestige of this body and its many Members was brought to bear, we would soon be welcoming the hostages home.

I have never met the Reverend Benjamin Weir, but I have come to know and love his family. They want their father and their husband to be free. The Weir's are brave people, but there is a limit to their endurance.

Let us end their ordeal, and the ordeal of the other families.

The hostage families want to know that their Government and this Congress stands with them. Let us not fail them in this moment of need.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S SO-CALLED SANCTIONS

(Mr. HAYES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, once again President Reagan has misread the handwriting on the wall and has declined an opportunity to take the side of Americans who stand for the principles upon which our great Nation was founded. Rather than joining with the majority of the House and Senate in issuing concrete sanctions against the racist South African apartheid regime, the President has announced his own so-called sanctions in an attempt to sidestep a congressional veto override and to buy time

for his failed policy of constructive engagement.

Even Mr. Reagan's advisers agree with administration critics who say that the President's proposals would have no significant effect upon the South African economy. Mr. Reagan has only succeeded in giving lip service to the intent of legislation which was worked out by the House-Senate conference committee while creating a series of conditions, preconditions, and other loopholes which virtually assure the continued impotence of our Nation's southern Africa policies. Mr. Reagan's so-called sanctions call for no immediate or substantial change in our relationship with South Africa. They are merely an attempt to deflect criticism from the most tyrannical regime since Adolf Hitler's Third Reich. As a Member of Congress who has fought throughout my life for justice, equality, and opportunity for all people, I find Mr. Reagan's position to be dishonest and repugnant.

I warn our distinguished Senate colleagues and the American people not to be fooled by the President's "wolf in sheep's clothing" approach to South African apartheid. I sincerely hope that the Senate will go ahead with our efforts to align the United States of America with those people throughout the world who sincerely support the cause of democracy and self-determination for South Africa's black majority by passing the conference committee's bill.

□ 1235

#### SKEPTICISM ABOUT THE PRESIDENT'S STEPS ON APARTHEID AND TRADE

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent pronouncements on apartheid and trade have been greeted with wide skepticism by proponents in both parties of action on these two vital fronts. The source of the skepticism is clear.

The President has moved in each case, not out of choice, but because of current pressures from Congress and the American public. Whatever one may have thought of the results, the President's first term was characterized by action. The first months of the President's second term have been characterized by reaction.

As American industries have lost ground before the onslaught of subsidized imports, it has been necessary to push the President to get off the dime. As South Africa's minority has imprisoned or shot hundreds of its black majority, the President has moved only when he faced the cliff's edge of a veto-proof congressional majority.

That is why we are not, and should not, be willing to rely on executive actions or orders alone. They do not spring from clear commitment. Congress must act legislatively in each case to be certain that appropriate steps are fully and effectively taken.

#### CONFUSION OVER CONFERENCE REPORT ON ANTI-APARTHEID ACT

(Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise because there is some confusion that is being raised by those who are questioning the sincerity of those who support the Anti-Apartheid Act and the bipartisan coalition with regard to the conference report on the Anti-Apartheid Act.

Let it be known now that it is not a problem of the Democrats versus the Republicans. It is a question of what does America stand for—its values, its principles—and that should not be a partisan issue. That is why this House, by a vote of 380 to 40, voted for the conference report to impose modest but realistic restrictions on our economic activity with the apartheid regime of Pretoria.

I urge the other body not to be fooled by the political diversionary tactics of the White House to avoid any real restrictions, but to support bipartisanly the anti-apartheid conference report.

I urge the other body today to vote for full legislative action and send the right signal to Pretoria, not the good news that the President announced, which is good for Pretoria but bad for the victims in Soweto.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION AMENDMENTS OF 1985

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-263) on the resolution (H. Res. 262) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to extend and improve the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2266, AMTRAK AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEARS 1986 AND 1987

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. 99-264) on the resolution (H. Res. 263) providing for the consid-

eration of the bill (H.R. 2266) authorizing appropriations for Amtrak for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, establishing a commission to study the financial status of Amtrak, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3244, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1986

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 261 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. Res. 261

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3244) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 2, line 4 through page 3, line 8; beginning on page 4, line 8 through page 5, line 7; beginning on page 6, lines 16 through 20; beginning on page 14, line 18 through page 15, line 9; beginning on page 16, lines 4 through 19; beginning on page 18, line 10 through page 19, line 20; beginning on page 19, line 23 through page 20, line 10; beginning on page 21, lines 16 through 19; beginning on page 21, line 23 through page 23, line 7; beginning on page 24, line 3 through page 26, line 5; beginning on page 26, line 19 through page 27, line 9; beginning on page 30, lines 7 through 16; beginning on page 31, line 20 through page 32, line 5; beginning on page 32, line 12 through page 33, line 16; beginning on page 34, lines 1 through 8; beginning on page 37, lines 14 through 17; and beginning on page 40, line 1 through page 46, line 7; and all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 2, line 4 through page 3, line 8; beginning on page 4, line 8 through page 5, line 7; beginning on page 16, lines 4 through 19; beginning on page 19, lines 3 through 20; beginning on page 24, line 3 through page 26, line 5; beginning on page 26, line 19 through page 27, line 5; beginning on page 31, line 20 through page 32, line 5; beginning on page 40, lines 6 through 12; and beginning on page 41, line 1 through page 42, line 4. It shall be in order to consider the following amendments: (1) an amendment printed in the Congressional Record of September 10, 1985, by, and if offered by, Representative Coughlin of Pennsylvania, and all points of order against said amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived; (2) an amendment printed in the Congressional Record of September 10, 1985, by, and if offered by, Representative Lewis of California, and all points of order against said amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived; and (3) an amendment printed in the Congress-



sional Record of September 10, 1985, by, and if offered by, Representative Waxman of California, and all points of order against said amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 261 is a rule waiving points of order during the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3244, the Department of Transportation appropriation for fiscal year 1986.

Mr. Speaker, the rule does not provide for the bill's consideration since general appropriation bills are privileged under the Rules of the House. Provisions relating to time for general debate are also excluded from the rule. Customarily, general debate is limited by a unanimous-consent request by the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee prior to consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 261 waives clause 2 of rule 21, which prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in general appropriation bills, against specified provisions of the bill. House Resolution 261 also waives clause 6 of rule 21, which prohibits reappropriations or transfers in general appropriation bills, against specified provisions in the bill. Mr. Speaker, the specified provisions of the bill which have been protected by these waivers are detailed in the rule, by reference to page and line of the transportation appropriation bill. These waivers are necessary for some of the provisions because, while authorizing legislation for the programs involved are under consideration in the legislative process, they have not yet been enacted, and because a number of paragraphs contain legislative provisions.

House Resolution 261 also makes in order the following amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 10, 1985: An amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], an amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and an amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN]. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the amendments for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule 21, which, as I stated earlier, prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in general appropriation bills.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3244 appropriates \$11.1 billion in new budget authority for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal year 1986. The main provisions in the bill

are in title I which provides a total of \$10.5 billion in funding for the Department of Transportation. Title I appropriates \$2.5 billion in new budget authority to the U.S. Coast Guard, \$4 billion to the Federal Aviation Administration, \$82 million for the Federal Highway Administration, \$723 million for the Federal Railroad Administration, and \$3 billion for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

Title II of the bill provides \$554 million in new budget authority for transportation-related agencies. This includes appropriations of \$48 million for the Interstate Commerce Commission and \$428 million for the Panama Canal Commission.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3244 would provide funding for our Nation's transportation system that is essential to commerce, industry, and a healthy economy. This is an important measure that is vital to the Federal Government and to the American people. I urge my colleagues to adopt House Resolution 261.

□ 1245

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just by starting consideration of this rule the House has already progressed further on the Department of Transportation appropriation bill this year than it did last year.

Last year, the Rules Committee reported one rule, then went back and reported a second rule, and neither of the two rules was ever called up on the floor. The problem was that the authorizing committee and the appropriation committee did not agree on either procedure.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is similar to other rules reported for other general appropriation bills. It waives points of order because many of the appropriations in this bill are not yet authorized, and because there are provisions in this bill which constitute legislation on an appropriation bill. In addition there are some transfers of funds which could be knocked out on a point of order if not protected.

Besides providing the usual waivers requested by the committee, this rule makes in order three additional amendments and waives points of order to allow their consideration.

First, the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] deals with the Wastway project in New York City.

Second, the amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] deals with two demonstration projects in California.

And third, the amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] deals with the construction of the Los Angeles Metro rail subway system.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert the stated reasons for the committee's requested waivers, as follows:

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

The appropriations for Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses, and Coast Guard, operating expenses, may technically be subject to a point of order since they contain transfers of funds.

The appropriation for Coast Guard, reserve training, is not yet authorized. The necessary authorization for this appropriation is contained in S. 1160, the conference report for which is pending in the House.

The Federal Highway Administration, limitation on general operating expenses, language under highway beautification, and appropriations for railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects and Baltimore-Washington Parkway may technically be subject to a point of order.

The Federal Highway Administration appropriations for the airport highway demonstration project and the rail line consolidation project may technically be subject to points of order since the authorizing legislation for these appropriations has not been enacted and they contain transfers of funds. Authorization for these items is pending in the Public Works and Transportation Committee.

Part of the appropriation for National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, operations and research, is not authorized. The necessary authorization for this appropriation is pending in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The appropriations for Federal Railroad Administration, railroad safety and redeemable preference shares are not authorized. The authorizations for these appropriations are contained in H.R. 2372, which passed the House on September 5, 1985. Of these, the appropriation for redeemable preference shares contains a transfer of funds.

The appropriation for Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation is not authorized. Authorizing legislation for this appropriation is contained in H.R. 2266 which was reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee on May 23, 1985. This appropriation also contains a transfer of funds.

The Federal Railroad Administration appropriations for rail service assistance and Conrail commuter transition assistance may technically be subject to a point of order.

Part of the appropriation for Research and Special Programs Administration, research and special programs, is not authorized. The authorization for this item has been reported by the Public Works and Transportation, Energy and Commerce, and Judiciary Committees.

#### TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

The appropriation for Interstate Commerce Commission, salaries and expenses, may technically be subject to a point of order since it includes a transfer of funds.

The appropriations for Panama Canal Commission, operating expenses and capital outlay, are not authorized. Authorization for these items is contained in H.R. 1784, which passed the House on May 14, 1985.

The appropriation for United States Railway Association, administrative expenses, is not authorized.

In addition, certain sections in title III of the bill, General Provisions, may be subject to a point of order. Specifically, section 311 and sections 316 through 325 are of interest to several Members.

Mr. Speaker, there was one other amendment, sought by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] which should have been made in order, but failed to get in by a vote of 4 to 5. It would have provided for a reduction of \$30 million for a railroad line in New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, if this House is serious about ever reducing the deficit, we must have greater reductions in expenditures than appear in this appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY) laid before the House the following communication from Hon. RONALD V. DELLUMS, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, September 10, 1985.  
Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL,  
Speaker of the House, Office of the Speaker,  
H-204, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. After consultation with the General Counsel to the Clerk, I will inform you of the determinations as required by the House Rule.

Sincerely,

RONALD V. DELLUMS,  
Member of Congress.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 3244) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, and that I be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1986

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R.

3244) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair designates the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and requests the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1252

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3244, with Mr. MOAKLEY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we submit for your consideration and for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole the bill, H.R. 3244, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal year 1986.

Before I get into the details of this particular bill, I first want to express my appreciation to the Members who serve on the transportation appropriations subcommittee. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK], all provided insight and perspective during the 3-month indepth review we gave to Federal transportation programs and policies during our hearing process. It is a real pleasure to serve with them. The subcommittee minority members

have been equally diligent. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTEL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], all are to be commended for the spirit of cooperation they have displayed and the commitment they have shown to developing a safe and effective transportation system for this Nation. I want to make special mention of the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], who has spent long hours in committee hearings and has displayed a broad knowledge of our transportation programs and policies. I pay tribute to his knowledge and dedication, and I want him to know of my great appreciation for his sound judgment and cooperation. We have tried to work as a team on this bill, rather than on a partisan basis. And I think that has been to the benefit of this country.

Mr. Chairman, in preparation for this bill the committee developed a hearing record contained in eight volumes amounting to 7,273 pages. Testimony was received from more than 240 witnesses including 29 Members of Congress.

The committee, I believe, has carefully reviewed the programs of the Department of Transportation and related agencies, and is recommending what we consider to be sufficient funds in light of current budgetary constraints to enable these agencies to help meet the requirements of our Nation's transportation system.

#### SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Mr. Chairman, the bill before you totals \$26,544,587,569—of which approximately \$11.14 billion is new budget authority and \$15.41 billion is liquidating cash.

In addition, the bill places limitations on contract authority obligations for various programs totaling over \$16.18 billion.

The bill provides for approximately 110,000 permanent positions for the agencies funded in the bill. This is slightly fewer than in fiscal year 1985 and includes 38,728 military positions for the Coast Guard, 48,002 positions for the FAA, and 5,793 civilian positions for the Coast Guard.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of new budget authority, the bill is \$537.2 million, or 4.6 percent below the fiscal year 1985 level.

#### BUDGET RESOLUTION TARGET

I think the Members would also be interested to know that the bill as reported by the full Appropriations Committee is about \$19 million under our section 302(b) allocation. With regard to just discretionary authority, we are about \$200,000 below our section 302(b) allocation. As the Members know, under the Budget Act, the Budget Committee provides a lump sum allocation to the Appropriations



Committee pursuant to section 302(a) and the Appropriations Committee then subdivides that among its 13 subcommittees. Our target for discretionary budget authority that was provided to us by the Committee on Appropriations is \$10.75 billion and we are within that amount.

#### SELECTED MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

With respect to the major funding recommendations in this bill, I would call the attention of the Members to pages 2 and 3 of the report. The major bill highlights are as follows:

First, the appropriation of \$2,449,000,000 for urban mass transportation formula grants, the same as the fiscal year 1985 appropriation;

Second, a provision providing for obligations of not to exceed \$13,800,000,000 for Federal-aid highways;

Third, the appropriation of \$2,679,600,000 for operations of the Federal Aviation Administration, \$49,670,000 less than the budget request;

Fourth, the appropriation of \$1,785,200,000, including funds derived by transfer, for operating expenses of the Coast Guard;

Fifth, a total of \$616,000,000 including funds derived by transfer, for Amtrak grants;

Sixth, a provision providing for obligations of not to exceed \$1,100,000,000 for the discretionary grant program of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration;

Seventh, the appropriation of \$1,059,000,000 for facilities and equipment of the Federal Aviation Administration;

Eighth, a provision providing for obligations of not to exceed \$1,000,000,000 for airport development and planning grants;

Ninth, the appropriation of \$267,300,000 for the capital acquisition, construction, and improvement programs of the Coast Guard;

Tenth, the appropriation of \$190,000,000 for the research, engineering, and development activities of the Federal Aviation Administration;

Eleventh, an increase of \$38,700,000 over the budget for certain railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects; and

Twelfth, the appropriation of \$250,000,000 for transit projects substituted for interstate highway segments.

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Chairman, for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, the bill provides a total of \$89,500,000—an increase of \$33.8 million from the current level and \$31.947 million above the budget. The bulk of this increase is for continuation of essential air service subsidies, which the administration proposed to eliminate. In addition, office-by-office statutory dollar breakdowns are specified in the bill for the Office of the Secretary.

#### COAST GUARD

With respect to the Coast Guard, the committee recommends a total program level of \$2,511,622,000—which is \$79.6 million below the fiscal year 1985 program level. This decrease is composed almost entirely of reductions in the Coast Guard's acquisition, construction, and improvements capital account. The committee believes such reductions are reasonable in light of the large, unexpected amounts appropriated for this activity in Defense Appropriation Acts over the last several years and the large unobligated balance of over \$550 million in this account. Excluding AC&I, the bill reflects more than a \$33 million increase in Coast Guard program levels between fiscal years 1985 and 1986.

The committee believes this level provides for a balanced program with emphasis on maritime law enforcement—especially drug interdiction; national defense commitments; search and rescue capabilities; dependability and safety of Coast Guard ships, boats, aircraft, and shore facilities; and the welfare and safety needs of Coast Guard personnel. We believe that this level will support a reasonable level of Coast Guard requirements for fiscal year 1986.

For Coast Guard operating expenses, the bill provides a program level of \$1,785 billion for fiscal year 1986. In addition, \$15 million is expected to carry over from previous appropriations and another \$15 million is designated for transfer from the Navy to the Coast Guard in the 1986 defense authorization conference report. This would bring the total amount available for fiscal year 1986 Coast Guard operating expenses to \$1,815,200,000—which is \$46.6 million more than the amount provided in fiscal year 1985.

The bill would also provide that not less than \$325 million of the operating expenses appropriation be available for drug interdiction activities. This is the first time we have carried such a provision, but it is in keeping with the committee's strong commitment to adequately funding such activities.

The operating expense funding level of \$1.785 billion will support 37,051 military positions and 4,655 civilian positions. These levels are 469 military and 70 civilian positions above the budget request. The additional \$15 million in the pending 1986 Defense Authorization Act would support an additional 500 military positions. Included in the recommended increase is \$5 million and 150 military positions for the continued operation of all Great Lakes stations that were proposed to be closed or "seasonalized" by the administration.

For acquisition, construction, and improvements, we are recommending \$267.3 million. This is comprised of \$93.8 million for vessel acquisitions

and improvements; \$37 million for aircraft; \$64.3 million for shore facilities; \$18.3 million for aids to navigation; \$28.4 million for command, control and communications, and related systems; and \$25.5 million for administration, planning, and design.

The bill also includes \$7.195 million to alter or remove bridges that are unreasonable obstructions to waterborne commerce, and \$23 million for research, development, test, and evaluation.

The sum of \$351.8 million is provided for the pay of retired military personnel of the Coast Guard and Coast Guard Reserve. This is based on an average of 24,298 personnel on the retired rolls.

For reserve training, the full budget request of \$61.502 million is recommended. This will provide for a ready reserve of 17,800 including a selected reserve of 12,500.

For the State Recreational Boating Safety Assistance Program, we recommend an appropriation of \$13.625 million. This is the same as last year's level.

The bill also contains appropriations of \$1 million each for the deepwater port liability fund and the offshore oil pollution compensation fund.

#### FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

For the Federal Aviation Administration, we are recommending a total program of \$5,040,400,000 for fiscal year 1986. This is \$260,461,500 less than the enacted fiscal year 1985 level, and \$166,048,000 less than the budget request. This level will provide sufficient funds to continue the restoration of the air traffic control system, continue modernization of the national airspace system, improve our airports, and continue important safety regulatory and research initiatives.

For FAA operations, the committee recommends appropriations of \$2.744 billion, including \$64.4 million for headquarters administration. This represents an increase of \$52.5 million over the fiscal year 1985 level of \$2,691,500,000. This would provide for 44,965 positions including 19,551 controllers, supervisors and support personnel for centers and towers, and 4,603 flight service station personnel.

According to FAA testimony, the air traffic control system resumed handling 1981 traffic levels in April 1984. Since then, significantly higher levels have been handled. The FAA is currently staffed at about 92 percent of its goal of 11,285 operational controllers for terminals and centers. The shortfall is mainly in the centers, which are continuing to use high levels of overtime to compensate for shortages in experienced controllers. The FAA testified that it is "shooting for" attaining 100 percent of its goal by the end of fiscal year 1985. New controller staffing goals for 1985 will

be set by the FAA later this month. The FAA administrator has testified that a complement of 11,285 operational controllers "will be adequate to handle the projected traffic." We have based our budget recommendation on that assurance.

With regard to controller training, the committee has expressed concern in the report accompanying this bill about the fact that as of April about 69 percent of the FAA's controllers were "full performance level qualified." This compares to about 82 percent immediately prior to the strike. The FAA Administrator testified that he intended to reach the 82-percent figure in 1987—with interim goals of 72 percent in September 1985, and 76 percent in 1986. The committee recognizes that attaining these goals will take time, and that any shortcuts in such training could be counterproductive. Attaining these training levels has to come primarily from on-the-job experience. However, options do exist to increase the experience level of the controller work force on a short term basis, such as hiring reemployed annuitants, which the committee has directed the FAA Administrator to plan for on a contingency basis. If the FAA reports to us that additional flexibility is desirable, we will consider any necessary supplemental request.

Moving on to trust fund contributions, of the \$2.744 billion provided for FAA operating expenses in fiscal year 1986, the bill specifies that \$644 million, or 23.5 percent of the total, be derived from the airport and airway trust fund.

For facilities and equipment, the bill contains \$1.059 billion for fiscal year 1986. This is a decrease of \$299 million from the fiscal year 1985 level of \$1.358 billion and is also \$87.5 million below the budget request. The major reductions in this account include deletions of \$13.3 million for three new turboprop aircraft, \$12.75 million for construction and field site preparation for the advanced automation system, \$19.2 million for various tower projects, and \$5 million to begin a Loran-C navigation system.

With respect to the NAS plan, the committee has been generally satisfied with the FAA's progress in its implementation. However, we have concerns about several managerial aspects of this program, and we plan to continue to maintain close oversight of this plan throughout its implementation. Of particular concern to the committee is the FAA's ability to: First, minimize program slippages that now show up in about 30 percent of NAS plan project schedules; second, prevent large cost overruns; and third, achieve the large number of facility consolidations that will be required. We also have specific concerns about the host computer, advance automation system, and weather radar procurements that

are described in the accompanying report.

With respect to FAA research, engineering, and development, the committee recommends \$190 million, which is a decrease of \$7.925 million from the budget request.

The bill also includes a \$1 billion obligation limitation on airport development and planning grants. This is the highest funding level ever provided for this program.

The Airport and Airway Development Act of 1982 specifically provides that "the safe operation of the airport and airway system will continue to be the highest aviation priority." And it further provides that "all airport and airway programs should be administered consistent with the section of the FAA Act which specifies the assignment and maintenance of safety as the highest priority in air commerce \* \* \*." Therefore, I believe that safety is to be the highest priority in the administration of the airport improvement program.

The bill also includes \$35.4 million for the operation and maintenance of metropolitan Washington airports, and \$12 million for construction projects at those airports.

The committee has also reduced the FAA's authority to borrow from the Treasury to pay defaulted aircraft purchase loans from \$125 million to \$10 million. Testimony indicates that the FAA has paid approximately \$153 million a result of defaulted loans. The committee is alarmed at the extent of these defaults and believes that the requested borrowing authority of \$125 million for fiscal year 1986 would offer virtually no incentive for the parties involved to employ options, such as rolling over the loan or extending the payment time, to attempt to work out a potential default. The committee, therefore, has reduced the amount of borrowing authority to \$10,000,000. If this is insufficient, the committee, of course, would consider a supplemental request for the payment of loan defaults.

#### FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Under the Federal Highway Administration, the bill provides for a total fiscal year 1986 program level of \$15.054 billion in highway aid. This includes a limitation of Federal-aid highway contract authority obligations of \$13.8 billion. The total FHWA program level is \$767.8 million more than the budget request and almost \$696 million more than that provided in fiscal year 1985.

The bill provides a total of \$204.5 million for FHWA administrative expenses, an increase of \$739 thousand from the budget request. Included in this amount is \$5 million to support a minority business bonding demonstration program. The committee expects the FHWA to implement this program without further delay.

The bill also contains an appropriation of \$38.7 million for railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects in six different cities.

A \$10 million limitation on highway-related safety grants is also contained in the bill for fiscal year 1986, the same as the budget request, and an appropriation of \$8.5 million is recommended for highway safety research and development, which is the same as last year's level.

The committee recommends funds for four additional items not in the budget request: \$2.75 million for an airport-highway demonstration project, \$5 million for a rail line consolidation demonstration project, \$6.5 million for reconstruction of a section of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, and a provision extending the availability of highway beautification funds.

The committee also recommends continuing the motor carrier safety grant program at \$14 million, which is the current rate, and providing \$13.9 million for the operations and research of the bureau of motor carrier safety.

#### NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

For the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the bill includes \$89.365 million for operations and research. This is \$8.736 million less than the program level proposed in the budget request, and \$7.823 million more than the fiscal year 1985 level.

The bill also reserves \$10 million of this appropriation to initiate a 3-year pilot project to implement the recommendations contained in the National Academy of Science's report *Injury in America*. The committee is hopeful that the research recommendations in that report can produce larger payoffs in the injury-related research work currently funded by the NHTSA.

The committee also recommends a limitation on obligations for the State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program of \$126.5 million—the same as the current rate.

For the Alcohol Safety Incentive Grants Program, we have established a limitation on obligations of \$28.8 million in fiscal year 1986. This corresponds to NHTSA's estimate of fiscal year 1986 obligations for this program.

For safety education and information grants, we have established a combined fiscal year 1983, 1984, 1985, and 1986 obligation limitation of \$5 million. The committee expects to assess the results of past and ongoing media campaigns before it will recommend additional funding for such purposes.

#### FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Chairman, for the Federal Railroad Administration, major recommendations include \$28 million for rail



safety, \$11.2 million for research and development, \$20.2 million for rail service assistance, \$35.5 million for the redeemable preference share program (including \$5.5 million by transfer), and \$10 million for Conrail commuter transition assistance.

For Amtrak, we are recommending the sum of \$616 million (including \$15 million derived by transfer). Of course, the President proposed deleting all Amtrak funds. The amount we are recommending is a 10-percent reduction from last year's level. We expect that all existing routes and services will be maintained at this funding level—including section 403(b) and 403(d) service under the existing funding formulas. Bill language is also included continuing the statutory conditions for rehabilitating and operating a new route between Philadelphia and Atlantic City, and establishing a 60-percent Federal match for the Westside connector project in New York City.

In addition, the bill includes \$12.5 million for Northeast corridor capital improvements. This sum will be of direct benefit to Amtrak.

#### URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

For the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, the committee recommends a total program level of \$4,108,603,000 for fiscal year 1986. This is \$2,731,198,000 more than the budget request, but \$42,897,000 less than the enacted fiscal year 1985 level.

Under the Formula Grant Program, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,449,500,000, which is the same as the fiscal year 1985 level. The administration proposed the elimination of this appropriation for fiscal year 1986. The committee's recommendation would provide operating assistance in accordance with the formulas established in the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 which was signed by the President on January 6, 1983.

The bill also includes language limiting obligations for transit discretionary grants to \$1.1 billion. This amount corresponds to the authorized level in the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982. The committee report also makes various allocations under the discretionary grant program.

The bill includes \$250 million for transit projects that have been substituted for interstate highway projects. Of this amount, 50 percent is to be distributed on a formula basis and 50 percent on a discretionary basis. The discretionary funds will be distributed as stated in the committee report.

The bill would also appropriate \$250 million under the so-called Stark-Harris authorization to continue construction of the Washington Metrorail system.

The bill provides \$59.1 million for research and administrative expenses of UMTA.

Under the general provisions title of the bill, letters of intent are mandated for three new start rail transit projects, authorization is provided for the reallocation of certain section 5 funds apportioned in fiscal years 1982 and 1983, a directive is given to UMTA to reapportion lapsing section 5 funds, and authorization is provided for the use of certain UMTA funds for construction management activities.

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The bill limits the administrative expenses of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to \$1.890 million, \$52,000 less than the budget request.

#### RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

For the Research and Special Programs Administration, the bill contains \$19.4 million, \$500,000 more than the fiscal year 1985 level.

#### INSPECTOR GENERAL

For the Office of the Inspector General, the bill includes an appropriation of \$27,950,000. This is \$258,000 more than the budget request.

#### TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Title II of the bill contains \$554,127,569 in new budget authority for six transportation-related agencies and commissions. This is \$20,939,000 below the cumulative budget requests, and \$56,593,376 below last year's level.

More specifically, the committee is recommending \$2 million for the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, \$22,400,000 for the National Transportation Safety Board, a total of \$50.48 million for the Interstate Commerce Commission, \$427.784 million for the Panama Canal Commission, \$2.1 million for the United States Railway Association, and \$51,663,569 for the Federal share of interest payments for the bonded indebtedness of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

Mr. Chairman, last, I would inform the Members that at the appropriate time I plan to offer an amendment to reduce the amounts in the bill by \$1 billion to bring the bill more in line with congressional efforts to reduce the deficit. I will explain my amendment in detail during the reading of the bill.

□ 1300

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3244, the fiscal year 1986 transportation appropriations bill. The bill provides, as the chairman has pointed out, more than \$11 billion in new budget authority, which is an increase of \$3 billion over the \$7.8 billion requested in the budget. However, the amount is \$537 million less than the amounts enacted to date for simi-

lar activities in fiscal year 1985. So it is very fair to say that this bill is a freeze at last year's levels and is certainly not a budget buster. It is a freeze.

There are \$15 billion recommended to liquidate contract authorizations, and \$16 billion are recommended to limit obligations on contract authority programs.

I might say that it is a tremendous pleasure for me to have the opportunity to work with Chairman BILL LEHMAN, who is a friend and who knows the transportation field like he knows the back of his hand. Certainly there is no more fair and compassionate Member in this body, and also no better salesman, I might add, and no better advocate for transportation.

With other subcommittee members, such as SILVIO CONTE, CARL PURSELL, FRANK WOLF, MARTY SABO, BILL GRAY, BOB CARR, DICK DURBIN, and BOB MRAZEK, it is a treat to be associated with such an illustrious group. My thanks go as well to the staff who worked on this bill, Jeff Jacobs and Kenny Kraft for the minority, Tom Kingfield, Greg Dahlberg, Lucy Hand, Linda Muir, and Janet Oakley for the majority.

Chairman LEHMAN has already explained what is in the bill, so I will not go into great detail to repeat what he has said.

I might say that this is a tremendously important bill, however. It does indeed provide the funding for critical programs for highways across this great Nation of ours, for all airports and airways, for the Coast Guard and waterways, for Amtrak and for mass transit.

Let me say, as I have said so often in the past, that the Federal Government has assumed a responsibility for transportation that is historic. Going back indeed to the days of the Roman Empire and before, federal governments have always assumed responsibility for providing transportation between communities.

These are the ties that bind our great land, allow our people the ability to move from place to place, provides the mobility for which Americans are so famous, and, indeed, bring this land together.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JONES of North Carolina was allowed to speak out of order.)

#### THE TITANIC MARITIME MEMORIAL ACT OF 1985

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am today introducing a bill to designate the shipwreck of the ocean liner, the *Titanic*, as a maritime memorial to the men and women who were aboard when she sank on April 14, 1912. This bill is intended to pro-

tect the wreckage, which is of national and international historical, scientific, and cultural significance.

The *Titanic* was the largest, most luxurious oceanliner of its time. She was considered invincible when, on her maiden voyage, an iceberg cut a 300-foot gash below the water line. Although more than 700 passengers were saved, well over twice that number perished. This major maritime disaster resulted in improved vessel safety regulations.

The wreckage of the *Titanic* lies off the coast of Newfoundland, in international waters. It is well preserved in the cold, anoxic North Atlantic waters, 2.5 miles below the ocean's surface. The ocean environment in which the *Titanic* rests provides a unique opportunity for scientists to conduct deep ocean scientific research and exploration. Through well-planned, collaborative research efforts, much can be learned about the processes of corrosion and preservation at the depths of the sea floor. This knowledge could result in better understanding of whether the deep ocean may be the proper environment for other ocean activities.

An objective of this bill is to ensure that the *Titanic* is maintained intact, where she rests on the sea floor, while the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] establishes national guidelines for conducting research on, and exploration and salvage of the wreckage.

Because the *Titanic* was originally owned and insured by British firms, sank off the coast of Canada, in international waters, was discovered through the collaborative efforts of an American expedition and a French expedition, and is the gravesite of men and women from several different nations of the world, the shipwreck is of international significance. Therefore, this bill directs the United States to negotiate with Great Britain, France, Canada, and other interested nations to establish an international agreement which will protect the scientific and cultural significance of the *Titanic*. This agreement shall be consistent with the guidelines promulgated by NOAA.

In 1975, NOAA designated the Monitor National Marine Sanctuary to protect the shipwreck of the U.S.S. *Monitor* off the coast of North Carolina. Together with the National Trust for Historic Preservation, NOAA convened a national conference to develop a structured research program to document, map and survey the shipwreck. Since then a master plan has been designed to govern activities related to the shipwreck. Research is being carried out in a highly productive manner. The experience with the U.S.S. *Monitor* demonstrates the importance of a carefully planned research effort, and could serve as a

model for activities relating to the shipwreck *Titanic*.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask if the gentleman from Florida would engage in a colloquy with me.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Yes, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. WISE. As the gentleman may know, I have been active in trying to promote the increased use of methanol as a transportation fuel in automobiles and buses. In this regard, I have been working with officials of my regional transportation district [KRT] in Charleston, WV, to put together a mass transit demonstration program employing methanol buses. KRT's intent would be to analyze the performance of this fleet in operations maintenance, and other characteristics to see if methanol is indeed the way to go. Is it the committee's intention that the funding under the appropriation for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration can be used for just this sort of purpose?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Yes, the gentleman is correct. Funding under the research, training, and human resources, the formula grants, and the discretionary grants programs may be used for just the sort of purpose that you indicate.

Mr. WISE. Is it the committee's intent that the Department of Transportation should be encouraged to look favorably on UMTA grant proposals that deal with the development of methanol bus fleets?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. The committee certainly feels that the Department of Transportation should give these applications a high priority. Methanol development has been a high priority of the gentleman from West Virginia, and I can understand his desire to see it grow. I would encourage the gentleman from West Virginia to pursue with the Department his desire to expand the use of methanol-powered buses, and am glad to assist him in this regard.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Florida.

I would ask the Chairman, the gentleman from Florida, his subcommittee has been very supportive of aviation airports and I want to thank the gentleman and also the ranking minority member and all of the members for that support. I think it is very important for economic growth.

During the hearings with the FAA this year, the need for a glide slope at the Ardmore Industrial Airport was discussed. I visited with Mr. CARR. He has been down in that area also.

As the gentleman knows, the addition of a glide slope to the localizer equipment at Ardmore would provide this particular area with a needed complete instrument landing system, which is very much needed.

The use of Ardmore's landing site for both private and military aircraft continues to rise due in large part to its prime location between Dallas and Oklahoma City and its runways in that area.

Would the chairman agree that it is the intent of the committee that the FAA continue to work with the city of Ardmore in meeting the pending request for a glide slope at the Ardmore Industrial Airport?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Yes. I would hope that the FAA would work closely with Ardmore and make every effort to look seriously at the glide slope request and move forward on it in the future.

I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this up.

I visited with his constituents from the city of Ardmore yesterday. I enjoyed the meeting with them and if the gentleman keeps working as hard as he has with this committee, this will not be the Ardmore Industrial Airport. This will be the Ardmore International Airport.

Mr. WATKINS. I will relay that back down there.

I want to thank the chairman for concurring and I want to thank the ranking minority member and the entire committee and Mr. CARR for taking some precious time to come to my area and to be there at the Ardmore Airport and seeing the potential for a high unemployment, low per capita area, strategically located between Dallas and Oklahoma City and the great potential it has if we can actually provide the structure; so again, I thank the chairman.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my colleagues on H.R. 3244, the Department of Transportation appropriations for fiscal year 1986, which is below last year's level and has been brought into conformity with the budget resolution. The committee has exhibited significant restraint in the struggle to deal with our staggering deficits.

I also applaud my colleagues on the Transportation Subcommittee for accomplishing this while at the same time preserving adequate Coast Guard protection for the recreational and commercial users of the Great Lakes.

Earlier this year, the OMB directed the Coast Guard to cut \$5 million from the Guard's operating expenses and mandated that all of these cuts be made in the Great Lakes region. The Coast Guard responded



with a plan to close down a number of stations and manning others during the summer months only.

It was obvious to all that this would have greatly increased the rescue response time in many parts of the Great Lakes. On Lake Michigan, the planned closure of the Chicago Air Station in Glenview, IL, would have largely eliminated all airborne rescue services from southern Lake Michigan. The planned closure of Chicago Air Station was announced only days after the station's helicopters conducted a dramatic rescue of fishermen locked in ice off Waukegan harbor.

I applaud the committee's efforts in bringing this bill under last year's level without cutting life-saving services vital to those who use the Great Lakes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3244, the Fiscal Year 1986 Department of Transportation Appropriations Act and I wish to commend Chairman BILL LEHMAN, the ranking minority member, LARRY COUGHLIN, and the other members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation for their fine work in developing this bill.

I especially applaud the work of the members of the subcommittee in recognition of the importance of maintaining our Nation's transportation systems, which are essential to maintaining the quality of life for our Nation's citizens. In many of our urban areas, such as the Cleveland metropolitan area, the availability of Federal assistance is especially critical to correcting safety and traffic problems caused by rapidly deteriorating roads and bridges. H.R. 3244, which includes appropriations totaling \$55.4 million for interstate substitute transfer grants for highway and transit projects in the Cleveland metropolitan area, will go a long way toward helping our region maintain a high quality of public transportation services. The funds provided in this bill will also help to fulfill the Federal commitment made to Ohio in 1979, when Cleveland relinquished funds for a 7.9-mile segment of Interstate I490 because of other highway and transit needs were more important to the maintenance of Cleveland's transportation system. These interstate substitute investments were then, and remain today, vital to Ohio's economy. Six years later, however, Ohio has received less than 43 percent of the substitute highway funds and only 27 percent of the substitute transit funds committed when the initial agreement was approved.

Mr. Chairman, the Cleveland metropolitan area has a strong record of utilizing Federal transportation dollars in a wise and effective manner. The projects which will be funded utilizing the resources provided in H.R. 3244 entail the reconstruction and renewal of basic transportation services. Commitments have already been made by local governments for the requisite non-Federal matching funds. These projects were identified as urgent in 1979 by local, State, and Federal agencies. They are needed even more critically now 6 years later.

Mr. Chairman, we can be proud and take comfort in the fact that Federal transportation dollars help our Nation's cities make needed investments in their infrastructures, their economies and their people. H.R. 3244 deserves our strong support.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H.R. 3244

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, namely:*

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY SALARIES AND EXPENSES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, including not to exceed \$30,000 for allocation within the Department of official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine; \$965,000 for the immediate Office of the Secretary, \$460,000 for the immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary, \$5,500,000 for the Office of the General Counsel, \$7,500,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs, \$2,180,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, \$2,570,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs, \$20,750,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, \$1,470,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, \$780,000 for the Executive Secretariat, \$400,000 for the Contract Appeals Board, \$1,300,000 for the Office of Civil Rights, \$500,000 for the Office of Commercial Space Transportation, \$970,000 together with \$330,000 to be derived from unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers" for the Office of Essential Air Service, \$580,000 for Regional Representatives, and \$4,575,000 for the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, of which \$3,500,000 shall remain available until expended and shall be available for the purposes of the Minority Business Resource Center as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 332: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available for the purposes of the Minority Business Resource Center in this or any other Act may be used for business opportunities related to any mode of transportation.

#### TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning, research, and development activities, including the collection of national transportation statistics, and university research and internships, to remain available until expended, \$3,000,000.

#### WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Department of Transportation Working Capital Fund not to exceed \$64,500,000 shall be paid, in accordance with law, from appropriations made available by this Act and prior appropriation Acts to the Department of Transportation, together with advances and reimbursements received by the Department of Transportation.

#### PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined under section 419 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1389), as is payable by the Department of Transportation \$36,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### COAST GUARD

##### OPERATING EXPENSES

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for; purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; and recreation and welfare, \$1,785,200,000 of which \$8,000,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances of "Pollution fund" and of which \$15,000,000 shall be derived from the Boat Safety Account: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available under this head \$786,800,000 shall be available for compensation and benefits of military personnel: *Provided further*, that, of the funds available under this head, not less than \$325,000,000 shall be available for drug enforcement activities: *Provided further*, the number of aircraft on hand at any one time shall not exceed two hundred and ten, exclusive of planes and parts stored to meet future attrition: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be available for pay or administrative expenses in connection with shipping commissioners in the United States: *Provided further*, that none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for expenses incurred for yacht documentation under 46 U.S.C. 103 except to the extent fees are collected from yacht owners and credited to this appropriation.

#### ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto; to remain available until September 30, 1990, \$267,300,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation shall issue regulations requiring that written warranties shall be included in all contracts with prime contractors for major systems acquisitions of the Coast Guard: *Provided further*, That any such written warranty shall not apply in the case of any system or component thereof that has been furnished by the Government to a contractor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Transportation may provide for a waiver of the requirements for a warranty where: (1) the waiver is necessary in the interest of the national defense or the warranty would not be cost effective; and (2) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified in writing of the Secretary's intention to waive and reasons for waiving such requirements: *Provided further*, That the requirements for such

written warranties shall not cover combat damage.

#### ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

For necessary expenses for alteration or removal of obstructive bridges, \$7,195,000 to remain available until expended.

#### RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations therefor otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, and payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefit Plans, and for payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C., ch. 55), \$351,800,000.

#### RESERVE TRAINING

For all necessary expenses for the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; maintenance and operation of facilities; and supplies, equipment, and services, \$61,502,000.

#### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for basic and applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law, \$23,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources and foreign countries, for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

#### OFFSHORE OIL COMPENSATION FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of title III of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978 (Public Law 95-372), \$1,000,000, to be derived from the Offshore Oil Pollution Compensation Fund and to remain available until expended. In addition, to the extent that available appropriations are not adequate to meet the obligations of the Fund, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$60,000,000 in fiscal year 1986 for the "Offshore Oil Pollution Compensation Fund".

#### DEEPWATER PORT LIABILITY FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 18 of the Deepwater Port Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-627), \$1,000,000, to be derived from the Deepwater Port Liability Fund and to remain available until expended. In addition, to the extent that available appropriations are not adequate to meet the obligations of the Fund, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase, without fiscal year limitation, notes or other obligations in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$50,000,000 in fiscal year 1986 for the "Deepwater Port Liability Fund".

#### BOAT SAFETY

For necessary expenses for recreational boating safety assistance under Public Law 92-75, as amended, the Public Law 98-369, \$13,625,000, to be derived from the Boat

Safety Account and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no obligations may be incurred for the improvement of recreational boating facilities.

#### FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

##### HEADQUARTERS ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of providing administrative services at the headquarters location of the Federal Aviation Administration, including but not limited to accounting, budgeting, personnel, legal, public affairs, and executive direction for the Federal Aviation Administration, \$64,400,000.

##### OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development, and for establishment of air navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the Airport and Airway Development Act, as amended, or other provisions of law authorizing obligation of funds for similar programs of airport and airway development or improvement; purchase of four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$2,679,600,000, of which not to exceed \$644,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be available for new applicants for the second career training program.

##### AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. MINETA

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MINETA: Page 9, line 10, strike out "\$2,679,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,694,600,000".

Page 10, line 7, strike out "\$1,059,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,044,000,000".

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will add \$15 million to the Aviation Standards account of the Federal Aviation Administration's operations to increase the staff of FAA's air carrier and general aviation operations and maintenance inspection program. The \$15 million will not add to the overall Department of Transportation appropriation because I am also offering a companion amendment to reduce the facilities and equipment account by \$15 million. Savings of far more than \$15 million have been achieved recently in activities financed by the facilities and equipment account as a result of lower than expected contract award costs for modernization of the enroute air traffic control computers.

Beginning in 1983, the House became very concerned over administration cuts in the FAA's airline safety inspection work force. At that time, we

were in the middle of nearly a 25-percent cut in the field inspectors and support staff charged with ensuring that airlines transporting the traveling public are being operated and maintained safely.

This 25 percent cut came at the same time that the number of airlines was increasing and many of the more established airlines were fundamentally changing the nature of their operations. This past cut was simply the wrong direction to go at the wrong time, given the changed environment resulting from the 1978 deregulation of entry to domestic routes and of domestic airline fares.

When we deregulated domestic route entry and fares, the Congress did not deregulate the safety standards we expected the airlines to meet. Nor did we ease up on the responsibilities of the Department of Transportation and the Federal Aviation Administration to administer aviation safety requirements and regulations.

Congress succeeded in getting those cut inspector positions restored in 1984, but my honorable and distinguished colleague, Chairman LEHMAN, and I have continued to be concerned that the FAA did not have enough people to adequately inspect the Nation's airlines. We commissioned the General Accounting Office to conduct a survey of FAA's inspections of 92 airlines in 1984. What they found was very disturbing. Some airlines received virtually no inspections by FAA. In other words, for those airlines, FAA had no means to know whether those airlines were being operated and maintained according to regulations and standards. At the same time, there appeared to be no strong correlation between the extent and type of services provided by various air carriers and the level and nature of safety inspections performed by FAA. It has become very clear to me that the FAA does not have the staff and resources required to assure the public that our Nation's air carriers are conducting safe operations.

This amendment will increase the authorized positions for aircraft operations and maintenance inspectors by 200. It will also provide an increase in the support staff so that the FAA can best utilize these additional inspectors as well as their existing field inspectors. As pointed out by the GAO study, there is overwhelming need for FAA to standardize the air carrier and general aviation operations and maintenance inspection and certification procedures, handbooks and guidance. In view of the disparities found throughout FAA's regions, 100 directional, administrative, and clerical support positions are being added here for FAA headquarters and the field structure.



Mr. Chairman, recent tragic events have generated much public concern about the safety of the Nation's air transportation system. I want to assure my colleagues and the public from my perspective as chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation that flying is safe. However, it does not matter how safe the system may be or how good aviation safety statistics may look if the public is not confident that it is safe to board an airplane. I believe my amendment will be an important step toward keeping it that way and toward restoring the public's confidence in aviation safety.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the very distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], who chairs the Subcommittee on DOT Appropriations.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I certainly have no objection to the amendments of the gentleman from California. We have both expressed concern about the effectiveness of FAA's aircraft certification and inspection activities and have jointly requested a GAO review of these activities. The initial GAO report indicates that there are inconsistencies and, perhaps, inadequacies in the FAA Certification Program.

I commend the gentleman for his leadership in this area and support his amendments.

□ 1315

Mr. MINETA. I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to our very fine colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I want to commend the gentleman for his amendment.

This certainly has not been a good year for aviation in this country or abroad. I guess there are tremendous concerns about the safety of our aviation equipment, and I support the gentleman's efforts. I think it is a very valuable amendment.

Mr. MINETA. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINETA. I am pleased to yield to my very fine colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT], the ranking Republican on the Aviation Subcommittee of our Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that citizens everywhere have been shocked and saddened by the number of recent airline accidents. It has been reported that 1985 is the worst year ever for aviation safety. This is particularly troublesome since it follows several years

where the airlines established records for their safety performance.

I am convinced that the airline system in this country remains basically safe but I am equally convinced that constant vigilance is necessary to maintain a high level of safety. Therefore, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee.

As he has stated, this amendment would add \$15 million for 200 additional Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] safety inspectors and 100 additional support staff. Since 1981, FAA staffing in the flight standards safety area has decreased substantially. This occurred at a time when many new carriers were starting or expanding service as a result of deregulation.

I believe that Secretary Dole recognizes the problems that this reduction in inspectors can cause. Last month she released a report prepared by her safety review task force which recommended improvements in the FAA Flight Standards Safety Program. The Administrator of the FAA, Donald Engen, in commenting on the task force report, acknowledged that improvements were needed and committed his agency to carrying out its recommendation.

I believe that the addition of the new safety inspectors funded by this amendment would go a long way toward helping Secretary Dole and Administrator Engen carry out their commitment to safety.

It is also important to note that this amendment will not increase the overall transportation appropriation. The additional \$15 million for inspectors will come out of the more than \$1 billion that this bill would appropriate for aviation facilities and equipment. The amendment therefore would not in any way affect the overall budget figures or the deficit.

Of course, as a practical matter, the FAA will not be able to hire all the new inspectors at once and thus may not be able to spend all of the \$15 million in 1 year. But this amendment will get them started in the right direction. I am confident that Administrator Engen will do his best to comply.

I, therefore, support this amendment and commend Mr. MINETA for offering it. I would also like to thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. WHITTEN, the ranking Republican, Mr. CONTE, and the leadership of the Transportation Subcommittee, Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. COUGHLIN for their fine work on this difficult and important appropriations measure.

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINETA. I am pleased to yield to our very fine colleague on the Committee on Public Works and Transpor-

tation, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI].

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of this amendment. I commend the gentleman for something that is long overdue.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, when we deregulated domestic route entry and fares, the Congress did not deregulate the safety standards that we expect the airlines to meet, nor did we ease up on the responsibilities of the Department of Transportation and the Federal Aviation Administration to administer aviation safety requirements and regulations.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join in support of this amendment.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Aviation Subcommittee chairman, Mr. MINETA. The Committee on Public Works and Transportation has been deeply involved in the Federal Aviation Administration's airline safety inspection program and has consistently resisted administration efforts to cut inspectors. We must allow no deterioration in the Government's ability to ensure that our Nation's airlines are being operated and maintained safely.

This amendment to provide \$15 million to increase the inspection work force by 300 people is a relatively small dollar amount in the grand scheme of things, but each of these dollars will be a dollar spent directly on aviation safety. The public is concerned about the safety of the air transportation system in light of some of the recent accidents, and they are asking what is being done to ensure that flying is safe. More safety inspectors and a better inspection program will have direct benefits for aviation safety. I urge my colleagues to join in support of the amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] to increase the number of air safety inspectors.

As we all know, there has been a recent surge in the number of airline accidents. Although none of these accidents have yet been tied directly to a lack of inspectors, there can be no doubt that these accidents raise doubts in the traveling public's mind about aviation safety. The reduction in the number of safety inspectors over recent years certainly does nothing to reassure them. This amendment should help restore that confidence.

In addition, there have been rapid and significant changes in the aviation environment in recent years. These changes have resulted from vastly accelerated technological advances and economic deregulation. These have raised concerns that the changes could lead to a reduction in aviation safety. Studies have shown that the airline industry is adapting well to these changes and that overall there has been no diminution in safety. But the question remains whether a reduced FAA inspector

work force can keep pace with the industry and the changing environment. I believe that now is the appropriate time to move forward and increase the number of safety inspectors in order to better meet the challenges they now face.

I am also pleased that this amendment will not have any effect whatsoever on the overall budget or the deficit. The \$15 million for additional inspectors will come out of the facilities and equipment account. Prior savings in that area allow this to be done without any harm to other important aviation programs.

I therefore support this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I would also like to thank Mr. MINETA for offering this amendment and the members of the Appropriations Committee for their fine work on this appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we return to page 8 for the purpose of offering one amendment only.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman explain why he is going back to this earlier portion of the bill?

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that I was on the other side of the aisle discussing another amendment and was not aware of the fact that that section was being called at that time. I intended to offer the amendment at that time.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Is this in regard to the Coast Guard?

Mr. MOLINARI. Yes; it is.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Is this in regard to the recruiting methods and funding that deals with recruiting methods of the Coast Guard?

Mr. MOLINARI. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARI

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOLINARI: On page 8, after line 17, add the following new section: "With regard to section 2901(a)(1) of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 (98 Stat. 1207), the Coast Guard will conform to the standards adopted by the Department of Defense."

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, which does not add any money to the bill, is to ensure that the Coast Guard will have within its budget the same authorizations and restrictions imposed upon the Department of Defense with regard to its ability to provide training for its regulars and reservists.

The restriction of funds previously authorized and funded to the Coast Guard for training purposes, travel, and per diem relating thereto, has seriously curtailed the necessary training of reservists, Regulars, and recent volunteers just coming on board. In this day of high tech and new programs introduced affecting intelligence gathering and drug interdiction it is imperative we give this line of defense the best available training to go along with the equipment this Congress has previously authorized.

It is my understanding that the Departments of State, Treasury, Justice, and Defense have exempted themselves from restrictions under section 2901 of the act. The importance of the Coast Guard, with its missions of defense and drug interdiction along with others, is vital to our national security and should be permitted to exercise the same options in its training programs as the agencies I have mentioned.

Repeating what I have previously stated, this amendment does not add 1 cent to the budget. In fact, with the end of this fiscal year just a few weeks away, it will not even restore to the Coast Guard funding previously appropriated. It will, however, insure against administrative cuts in this category from funds appropriated for the next fiscal year.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLINARI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection on this side to the gentleman's amendment, and we will be glad to accept it.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI].

The amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer a number of amendments, 1 through 12, and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. LEHMAN of Florida: On page 9, line 11, strike out "\$644,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$548,000,000".

On page 12, line 6, strike out "\$1,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$925,000,000".

On page 17, line 6, strike out "\$13,800,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$13,250,000,000".

On page 23, strike out lines 8 through 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

#### CONRAIL LABOR PROTECTION

##### (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Such sums as may be necessary shall be made available for necessary expenses of administration of section 701 of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 by the Railroad Retirement Board: *Provided*, That, of the funds heretofore appropriated under this head, \$8,000,000 are rescinded.

On page 24, line 11, strike out "\$616,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$603,500,000".

On page 28, line 8, strike out "\$2,449,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,210,000,000".

On page 28, line 13, strike out "\$1,100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,010,000,000".

On page 29, line 3, strike out "\$250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$237,500,000".

On page 29, line 7, strike out "\$250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$237,500,000".

On page 41, line 9, strike out the colon and all that follows down to and including the word "years" on line 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the \$429,000,000 shall include \$11,800,000 earmarked for fiscal year 1984, \$117,200,000 earmarked for fiscal year 1985, \$117,000,000 in fiscal year 1986 and, subject to the availability of funds from Congress, \$183,000,000 in subsequent fiscal years".

On page 42, line 15, strike out the colon and all that follows down to and including the word "years" on line 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the \$180,000,000 shall include \$20,000,000 earmarked for fiscal year 1984, \$49,000,000 earmarked for fiscal year 1985, \$36,000,000 in fiscal year 1986 and, subject to the availability of funds from Congress, \$75,000,000 in subsequent fiscal years".

On page 43, line 2, strike out the colon and all that follows down to and including the word "years" on line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the \$175,000,000 shall include \$24,300,000 in fiscal year 1986, and subject to the availability of funds from Congress, \$150,700,000 in subsequent fiscal years".

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the overall effect of the amendments we are now considering en bloc is to reduce the spending authority provided in this bill by \$1 billion. None of these reductions is desirable, but I think that they are all necessary given the large budget deficits this country faces and the expressed desire of this body for greater efforts to get our budget under control.

The net effect of this amendment is to reduce the amounts in the bill by roughly 4 percent. But I have consid-



ered the unique requirements of each and every account in the bill and have taken great care to spread the reductions more fairly than the administration proposed to do.

Some may ask why I simply did not make this a 4-percent across-the-board reduction—which seems the fairest approach at first glance. The reasons I rejected this approach are simply that some accounts are better able to absorb reductions than other accounts, and some accounts already have taken more reductions than other accounts. For instance, a 4-percent reduction in FAA operations would yield about \$110 million, but would lay off many air traffic controllers and, in my view, jeopardize the safety of the air traffic control system. A 4-percent cut in Coast Guard operating expenses could jeopardize our Federal drug interdiction efforts. The bill has already reduced FAA's facilities and equipment appropriation by \$299 million from last year's level, and has similarly reduced the Coast Guard's acquisition, construction and improvements account by \$113 million.

Specifically, these amendments would make the following reductions:

First, reduce the airport grant limitation on obligations by \$75 million—from \$1 billion to \$925 million. The effect of this reduction would be to continue this program at last year's rate—which was the highest funding level in this program's history.

Second, reduce the Federal-aid highway program limitation on obligations from \$13.8 billion to \$13.25 billion. This also would have the effect of continuing the Federal-aid highway program at the fiscal year 1985 rate—still the highest rate in this program's history.

Third, rescind \$8 million from the unobligated balance of Conrail labor protection. Conrail now has in excess of \$900 million in the bank and should, therefore, be required to pay its labor protection requirements from its own funds.

Fourth, reduce Amtrak grants by \$12.5 million—from a total of \$616 million to a total of \$603.5 million. This represents a cumulative reduction of 11.4 percent from the fiscal year 1985 level of \$684 million.

Fifth, reduce UMTA mass transit formula grants by \$239.5 million—from \$2,449,500,000 to \$2,210,000,000. This represents a 9.8-percent reduction from the fiscal year 1985 level. I would point out that the reductions would affect only capital funds—the current \$870 million level for operating assistance would be unaffected by this amendment.

Sixth, reduce the mass transit discretionary grant obligation limitation by \$90 million—from \$1.1 billion to \$1.01 billion. This represents an 8.2-percent total reduction, and a 10-percent reduction for each new start ear-

mark except for Santa Clara, which is under a full funding contract. Those revised funding allocations would be as follows:

Bus and bus facilities.....	\$115,000,000
Existing rail modernization and extensions.....	435,000,000
New systems and new extensions.....	380,000,000
Planning.....	50,000,000
Elderly and handicapped.....	25,000,000
Innovative techniques and technology introduction.....	5,000,000

#### New systems

Los Angeles (rail construction).....	117,000,000
Portland (light rail).....	8,100,000
Seattle (bus tunnel).....	24,300,000
Miami (circulator).....	36,000,000
Santa Clara (light rail).....	65,000,000
Atlanta (rail construction).....	63,000,000
Houston (busways).....	49,500,000
St. Louis (light rail engineering and design).....	9,000,000
San Diego (light rail).....	8,100,000

I want to stress that, aside from these revised dollar allocations, this amendment should not be interpreted as changing or modifying in any way the directives contained in the committee report.

Seventh, an amendment is also included that would reduce interstate transfer-transit grants by \$12.5 million—from \$250 million to \$237.5 million. This will necessitate a 5-percent pro rata reduction in the interstate transfer-transit discretionary allocations. The revised discretionary allocations would be as follows:

Sacramento.....	\$11,400,000
Chicago.....	66,500,000
Boston.....	23,750,000
Duluth.....	475,000
New Jersey.....	2,375,000
Cleveland.....	14,250,000

Eighth, an amendment is also included reducing Washington Metro grants by \$12.5 million—from \$250 million to \$237.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to these eight substantive amendments, four technical amendments are also included in the package to bring various provisions in conformance with the reductions I have just discussed.

In summation, I want to stress to the Members that these are extraordinary reductions for an extraordinary time. I think these are responsible reductions given our budgetary circumstances, and are eminently more fair than the reductions that have been proposed by others. These reductions spread the pain as evenly as possible across socio-economic lines and across modal transportation lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, these reductions are in response to the message that we have been get-

ting when we went back home, and in response to the mood I think that exists in the House of Representatives today, and I urge the adoption of these amendments.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee. On page 12 where he is reducing the grant-in-aid program for AIP from \$1 billion to \$925 million, it was my understanding that in these amendments none of the aviation funding was going to be touched, given the fact that this is aviation trust fund money, and there is sufficient income coming in from the ticket tax and the other sources to be able to continue full funding for grant-in-aid program for airports. I would just like to inquire of the chairman about this provision.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINETA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I understand the gentleman's concern. As he knows, this is trust fund money and the money will remain there.

I am just dealing with the problems of actual expenditures for this year. As I have stated before, the airport grant program still is at least year's level. The reduction certainly does not directly affect the safety of aviation.

I would hope the gentleman could support this amendment. We have tried to, as I said, make the pain of these reductions as even as possible, and I would not make the \$75 million reduction in this airport limitation if I did not have to, but I think we have to in order to keep a balanced reduction.

Mr. MINETA. If I may reclaim my time at this point, one of the concerns that I have is that noise compatibility programs are part of this section. As we have gone to the hub and spoke operations in the airline industry, we are now getting more operations at many airports. At hub airports, more airplanes are landing and taking off because of the hub-and-spoke operation which the airlines have gone to. This is creating noise problems.

Since the noise compatibility program is also a part of this section, it concerns me that the amendment would reduce the minimum requirements for that portion of the grants-in-aid program.

□ 1330

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. This has been a concern of the gentleman from California, I know. It has also been my concern. We have tried to work together on noise compatibility. I would hope we could make some legislative history urging that of the \$925 million which still remains, that noise compatibility remain a top priority of this program, and I would work with the

gentleman throughout this fiscal year to monitor this. If the gentleman would yield further, this is a very small reduction compared to some of the reductions we made in other programs such as mass transit. So everybody has got to hurt a little bit during a year such as we are faced with.

Mr. MINETA. If the distinguished gentleman would agree, could I ask that the minimum noise set-aside of 8 percent be based on the \$1 billion rather than on the \$925 million.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I would be more than happy to do so to the extent that the statute would allow it to be done.

Mr. MINETA. I wonder if we could keep that relationship there.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. If at all possible under the statute, I would urge the FAA to do as the gentleman requests.

Mr. MINETA. In the present law, the 8 percent set-aside for noise programs is a minimum and FAA is free to spend more than that on noise programs.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. This is an appropriation bill, and I do not know whether we could do that kind of authorizing legislation in this bill. I certainly could indicate that this would be the intent of this committee to implement it at that level.

Mr. MINETA. And if I may ask about page 9, line 11, the amendment reducing the \$644 million, what does that do?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. It conforms with the authorizing legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MINETA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I did not catch the gentleman's explanation of the purpose of the amendment on the \$644 million.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. If the gentleman would yield, it conforms with the authorizing formula in regard to the trust fund share.

Mr. MINETA. Very well. The amendment only reduces the amount of the funding for operations which can be taken from the trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 1986.

The Subcommittee on Transportation, on which I have served since its creation in 1967, has worked long and

hard to bring this bill before the House. I would like to pay special tribute to our chairman, BILL LEHMAN, and our ranking minority member, LARRY COUGHLIN, for their many hours in hearings and preparation of this bill.

As it stands, this bill provides \$11.1 billion in new budget authority to meet the vital transportation needs of our Nation, an amount that is \$537 million below last year's level. Our chairman has offered amendments that would reduce certain accounts by a total of approximately \$1 billion, which would enable us to meet the overall transportation function assumptions in the budget resolution.

I do not want to repeat all of the remarks that have been made outlining the provisions of this bill, but I would like to highlight a few items of particular interest and concern.

For the Coast Guard's operating expenses, we have provided \$1.78 billion, including \$786.8 million for military personnel compensation. This will permit a military personnel level of 37,051, an amount that is lower than last year but still 469 positions above the budget request. After holding extensive hearings, it became clear that in order to continue our antidrug effort in the Southeastern United States without detracting from the Coast Guard's traditional activities elsewhere in the country, it would be necessary to provide more personnel than the budget had requested. The amount provided will do that, and will, I might point out to my friends from the Great Lakes, permit the continued operation of all Great Lakes Coast Guard stations.

Under the Federal Railroad Administration, the committee has recommended \$616 million for Amtrak, a 10-percent cut from last year's level. Based upon our testimony, it is clear that any further reduction would force Amtrak to reduce service and downgrade frequencies to an unacceptable extent. Amtrak is an important transportation resource that every year receives less and less of its support from the Federal Government. The members of the committee strongly supported its continued operation.

The other items in the bill, including spending for highways, aviation, and urban transit, have been covered by our chairman. I would like to mention one provision having to do with the Transportation Systems Center in Cambridge, MA. This is the Department of Transportation's major research facility, and the bill prohibits any change in its current Federal status. This facility is a tremendous resource, and it was the conclusion of the committee that it should remain a Transportation Department facility.

Finally, let me say that at the appropriate time, I will support the amend-

ment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] to prohibit the use of interstate highway funds for the landfill portion of the Westway project in New York City. The landfill for this multibillion-dollar project is really a real estate development posing as a highway. In addition, this landfill will do tremendous damage to our national effort to restore the striped bass, or rockfish, to U.S. waters, by destroying the most important striped bass habitat on the east coast after the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when we are spending millions of dollars to clean up the Chesapeake Bay, we should certainly not be letting New York spend millions of Federal highway dollars to destroy this valuable habitat.

I want to commend the chairman once again. He just took a very courageous stand with his amendment reducing this bill by \$1 billion. I hope that the Congressmen and Congresswomen, who are in their offices and who will come here finally for the roll-call on final passage, will take that into consideration and not offer any across-the-board cuts. We opposed across-the-board cuts in committee because they would severely damage two agencies, at least, which cannot afford a single dollar to be cut. One is FAA, where there is a shortage of controllers, and of course we do not want any more airplanes coming down from the skies. It would also cut the Coast Guard, which is already bare-bones right now. At the present time the Coast Guard could use a lot more money than is in this budget.

I hope my colleagues will take that into consideration when we get to final passage. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to support the Coughlin amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his support of this legislation and for his service on this subcommittee. It has been yeomanlike, and I must say it is a pleasure to serve on the committee with him.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title I of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the balance of title I is as follows:

#### FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase,



and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities, including initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; engineering and service testing including construction of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; and construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations of officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Administration stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available; to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until September 30, 1990, \$1,059,000,000: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment and modernization of air navigation facilities: *Provided further*, That of the funds available under this head, \$5,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary of Transportation to enter into grant agreements with universities or colleges to conduct demonstration projects in the development, advancement, or expansion of airway science curriculum programs, and such money, which shall remain available until expended, shall be made available under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Transportation may prescribe, to such universities or colleges for the purchase or lease of buildings and associated facilities, instructional materials, or equipment to be used in conjunction with airway science curriculum programs.

#### RESEARCH, ENGINEERING AND DEVELOPMENT (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for research, engineering and development, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. 1301-1542), including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended, \$190,000,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall be available to construct an experimental computer-based Airway and Aviation Management Program in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. 1301-1542) at the Center for Research and Training in Information-based Aviation and Transportation Management at Barry University: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred for research, engineering and development.

#### GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for airport planning and development under section 14 of Public Law 91-258, as amended, and under other law authorizing such obligations, and obligations for noise compatibility planning and programs, \$693,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the commitments for which are in excess of \$1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1986 for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and noise compatibility planning and programs, notwithstanding section 506(e)(4) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement, and protection of the federally owned civil airports in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, including purchase of eight passenger motor vehicles for police use, for replacement only; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition, \$35,400,000: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from air carriers, concessionaires, and non-Federal tenants sufficient to cover utility and fuel costs which are in excess of \$6,682,000: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, or private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of the federally owned civil airports.

#### CONSTRUCTION, METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS

For necessary expenses for construction at the federally owned civil airports in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, \$12,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988.

#### AVIATION INSURANCE REVOLVING FUND

The Secretary of Transportation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures and investments, within the limits of funds available pursuant to section 1306 of the Act of August 23, 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1536), and in accordance with section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for aviation insurance activities under said Act.

#### AIRCRAFT PURCHASE LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

The Secretary of Transportation may hereafter issue notes or other obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury, in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. Such obligations may be issued to pay any necessary expenses required pursuant to any guarantee issued under the Act of September 7, 1957, Public Law 85-307, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1324 note). The aggregate amount of such obligations during fiscal year 1986 shall not exceed \$10,000,000. Such obligations shall be redeemed by the Secretary from appropriations authorized by this section. The Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase any such obligations, and for such purpose he may use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force. The purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include any purchase of notes or other obligations issued under the subsection. The Secretary of the Treasury may sell any such obligations at such times and price and upon such terms and conditions as he shall determine in his discretion. All purchase, redemptions, and sales of such obligations by such Secretary shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

#### FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

#### LIMITATION ON GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Necessary expenses for administration, operation, and research of the Federal High-

way Administration, not to exceed \$204,500,000, shall be paid, in accordance with law, from appropriations made available by this Act to the Federal Highway Administration together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Highway Administration: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$48,589,000 of the amount provided herein shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That, of the funds available under this limitation, \$5,000,000 shall be made available only for a Demonstration Bonding Program for economically and socially disadvantaged businesses: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this account funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities and private sources, for training expenses incurred for non-Federal employees.

#### HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

#### (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses in carrying out provisions of sections 307(a) and 403 of title 23, United States Code, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended, \$8,500,000.

#### HIGHWAY-RELATED SAFETY GRANTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 402, administered by the Federal Highway Administration, to remain available until expended, \$9,000,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available for "Limitation on general operating expenses": *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$10,000,000 in fiscal year 1986 for "Highway-related safety grants".

#### HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Funds appropriated and obligated to carry out sections 131 and 136 of title 23, United States Code, which have been deobligated subsequent to enactment of this Act shall remain available until expended.

#### RAILROAD-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

For necessary expenses of certain railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects as authorized by section 163 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$38,700,000, of which \$25,800,000 shall be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That the unobligated balance of funds appropriated in Public Law 93-98 for Wheeling, West Virginia, is hereby made available for allocation to carry out highway projects on the Federal-aid system in Wheeling, West Virginia.

#### FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways, including the National Scenic and Recreational Highway as authorized by 23 U.S.C. 148, not otherwise provided, including reimbursements for sums expended pursuant to the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 308, \$13,836,000,000 or so much thereof as may be available in and derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*,

That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$13,800,000,000 for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 1986, except that this limitation shall not apply to obligations for emergency relief under section 125 of title 23, United States Code, obligations under section 157 of title 23, United States Code, projects covered under section 147 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978, section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981, subsections 131 (b) and (j) of Public Law 97-424, section 118 of the National Visitors Center Facilities Act of 1968, or section 320 of title 23, United States Code.

**RIGHT-OF-WAY REVOLVING FUND (LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)**

During fiscal year 1986 and with the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall not exceed \$50,000,000.

**MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY**

For necessary expenses to carry out the motor carrier safety functions of the Secretary as authorized by the Department of Transportation Act (80 Stat. 939-940), \$13,900,000, of which \$953,000 shall remain available until expended, and not to exceed \$1,601,000 shall be available for "Limitation on general operating expenses".

**MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)**

For necessary expenses to carry out provisions of section 402 of Public Law 97-424, \$14,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until September 30, 1989.

**BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY**

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, to carry out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970, for the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, to remain available until expended, \$6,500,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to be withdrawn therefrom at such times and in such amounts as may be necessary: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding subsection (b) of section 146 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 and any agreement entered into under such subsection, the Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to convey to the State of Maryland any portion of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway located in the State of Maryland, and the State of Maryland shall not be required to accept conveyance of any such portion: *Provided further*, That funds authorized by such section may be expended without regard to any requirement of such an agreement that such portion of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway be conveyed to the State of Maryland.

**RAIL LINE CONSOLIDATION PROJECT (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

For necessary expenses to carry out a project to consolidate two rail lines on a common alignment in the vicinity of Orange, Texas, that demonstrates methods by which a rail line consolidation project will reduce motor vehicle traffic congestion and increase employment, to remain available until expended, \$5,000,000 to be derived from unobligated balances of "Research, training, and human resources".

**AIRPORT-HIGHWAY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

For necessary expenses to carry out a highway project to depress a highway in

Shawnee, Oklahoma, that demonstrates methods of improving air service to a small community by extension of a runway over a depressed road, to remain available until expended, \$2,700,000 to be derived from unobligated balances of "Research, training, and human resources".

**NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH**

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary with respect to traffic and highway safety and functions under the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (Public Law 92-513, as amended), \$89,365,000, of which \$25,120,000 shall be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$42,174,000 shall remain available until expended, of which \$10,180,000 shall be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided further*, That, of the funds available under this head, \$10,000,000 shall be available to implement the recommendations of the 1985 National Academy of Sciences report on trauma research.

**HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)**

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402, 406 and 408, and section 209 of Public Law 95-599, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$149,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs, the total obligations for which are in excess of \$126,500,000 in fiscal year 1986 for "State and community highway safety" authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used for construction, rehabilitation or remodeling costs or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local, or private buildings or structures: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs, the total obligations for which are in excess of \$28,800,000 for "Alcohol safety incentive grants" authorized under 23 U.S.C. 408: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs authorized by section 209 of Public Law 95-599, as amended, the total obligations for which are in excess of \$5,000,000 in fiscal years 1983, 1984, 1985, and 1986: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be available for administering the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402.

**FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION**

**OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR**

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, not otherwise provided for, \$10,120,000.

**RAILROAD SAFETY**

For necessary expenses in connection with railroad safety, not otherwise provided for, \$28,000,000, of which \$1,300,000 shall remain available until expended.

**RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

For necessary expenses for railroad research and development, \$11,200,000, to remain available until expended.

**RAIL SERVICE ASSISTANCE**

For necessary expenses for rail service assistance authorized by section 5 of the Department of Transportation Act, as amend-

ed, for Washington Union Station, as authorized by Public Law 97-125, and for necessary administrative expenses in connection with Federal rail assistance programs not otherwise provided for, \$20,200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided under this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of a program making commitments to guarantee new loans under the Emergency Rail Services Act of 1970, as amended, and that no new commitments to guarantee loans under section 211(a) or 211(h) of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, as amended, shall be made: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the acquisition, sale or transference of Washington Union Station without the prior approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That, of the funds available under this head, \$15,000,000 shall be available for allocation to the States under section 5(h)(2) of the Department of Transportation Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State may not apply for fiscal year 1986 funds available under section 5(h)(2) until such State has expended all funds granted to it in the fiscal years prior to the beginning of fiscal year 1981, other than funds not expended due to pending litigation: *Provided further*, That a State denied funding by reason of the immediately preceding proviso may still apply for and receive funds for planning purposes: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available under section 5(h)(2), \$10,000,000 shall be made available for use under sections 5(h)(3)(B)(ii) and 5(h)(3)(C) of the Department of Transportation Act, as amended, notwithstanding the limitations set forth in section 5(h)(3)(B)(ii).

**CONRAIL LABOR PROTECTION**

Such sums as may be necessary shall be made available for necessary expenses of administration of section 701 of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 by the Railroad Retirement Board.

**NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

For necessary expenses related to Northeast Corridor improvements authorized by title VII of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976, as amended (45 U.S.C. 851 et seq.), \$12,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of Public Law 85-804 shall apply to the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 322 (c) and (d) if such action would serve a public purpose: *Provided further*, That all public at grade-level crossings remaining along the Northeast Corridor upon completion of the project shall be equipped with protective devices including gates and lights.

**GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION**

**(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for operating losses incurred by the Corporation, capital improvements, and labor protection costs authorized by 45 U.S.C. 565, to remain available until expended, \$616,000,000, of which \$15,000,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances of "Conrail labor protection": *Provided*, That none of the funds herein ap-



propriated shall be used for lease or purchase of passenger motor vehicles or for the hire of vehicle operators for any officer or employee, other than the president of the Corporation, excluding the lease of passenger motor vehicles for those officers or employees while in official travel status: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make no commitments to guarantee new loans or loans for new purposes under 45 U.S.C. 602 in fiscal year 1986: *Provided further*, That the incurring of any obligation or commitment by the Corporation for the purchase of capital improvements prohibited by this Act or not expressly provided for in an appropriation Act shall be deemed a violation of 31 U.S.C. 1341: *Provided further*, That no funds are required to be expended or reserved for expenditure pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 601(e): *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this or any other Act shall be made available to finance the rehabilitation and other improvements (including upgrading track and the signal system, ensuring safety at public and private highway and pedestrian crossings by improving signals or eliminating such crossings, and the improvement of operational portions of stations related to intercity rail passenger service) on the main line track between Atlantic City, New Jersey, and the main line of the Northeast Corridor, unless the Secretary of Transportation certifies that not less than 40 per centum of the costs of such improvements shall be derived from non-Federal sources: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Railroad Passenger Corporation shall not operate rail passenger service between Atlantic City, New Jersey, and the Northeast Corridor main line unless the Corporation's Board of Directors determines that revenues from such service have covered or exceeded 80 per centum of the short term avoidable costs of operating such service in the first year of operation and 100 per centum of the short term avoidable operating costs for each year thereafter: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act shall be made available to finance the acquisition and rehabilitation of a line, and construction necessary to facilitate improved rail passenger service, between Spuyten Duyvil, New York, and the main line of the Northeast Corridor unless the Secretary of Transportation certifies that not less than 40 per centum of the costs of such improvement shall be derived from non-Amtrak sources.

#### RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT FINANCING FUNDS

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations pursuant to section 512 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-210), as amended, in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to pay any amounts required pursuant to the guarantee of the principal amount of obligations under sections 511 through 513 of such Act, such authority to exist as long as any such guaranteed obligation is outstanding: *Provided*, That no new loan guarantee commitments shall be made during fiscal year 1986.

#### REDEEMABLE PREFERENCE SHARES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The Secretary of Transportation is hereby authorized to expend proceeds from the sale of fund anticipation notes to the Secretary of the Treasury and any other moneys deposited in the Railroad Rehabilitation and

Improvement Fund pursuant to sections 502, 505-507, and 509 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-210), as amended, and section 803 of Public Law 95-620, for uses authorized for the Fund, in amounts not to exceed \$35,500,000, of which \$5,500,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances of "Rail labor assistance".

#### CONRAIL COMMUTER TRANSITION ASSISTANCE

For necessary capital expenses of Conrail commuter transition assistance, not otherwise provided for, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

##### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of the urban mass transportation program authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), and 23 U.S.C. chapter 1, in connection with these activities, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$31,000,000, of which not to exceed \$350,000 shall be available for the Office of the Administrator.

##### RESEARCH, TRAINING, AND HUMAN RESOURCES

For necessary expenses for research, training, and human resources as authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), to remain available until expended, \$28,103,000: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities and private sources, for expenses incurred for training.

##### FORMULA GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of sections 9 and 18 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), \$2,449,500,000, to remain available until expended.

##### DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs in excess of \$1,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986 for grants under the contract authority authorized in section 21(a)(2)(B) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

##### LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out section 21(a)(2) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), administered by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, \$720,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

##### INTERSTATE TRANSFER GRANTS—TRANSIT

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 103(e)(4) related to transit projects, \$250,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1987.

##### WASHINGTON METRO

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 14 of Public Law 96-184, \$250,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to the Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commit-

ments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Corporation's budget for the current fiscal year except as hereinafter provided.

#### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$1,890,000 shall be available for administrative expenses which shall be computed on an accrual basis, including not to exceed \$3,000 for official entertainment expenses to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Secretary of Transportation: *Provided*, That Corporation funds shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, operation and maintenance of aircraft, uniforms or allowances therefor for operation and maintenance personnel, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and \$15,000 shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

#### RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

##### RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Research and Special Programs Administration, for expenses for conducting research and development and for grants-in-aid to carry out a pipeline safety program, as authorized by section 5 of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 (49 U.S.C. 1674), \$19,400,000, of which \$6,975,000 shall remain available until expended.

#### OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$27,950,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against the remainder of title I?

The Chair hears none.

##### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COUGHLIN

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered By Mr. COUGHLIN: On page 15, line 9 strike the "." and insert the following in lieu thereof: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be used for the approval of, or to pay the salary of any person who approves, projects to construct a landfill in the Hudson River as part of an Interstate System highway in New York City."

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment would do would be to prohibit the expenditure of money for landfilling of the Hudson River as part of a project that is known as the Westway project. In this time of exacerbated deficits, it is important to recognize that this is potentially a \$4 billion to \$6 billion project. It would cost that much money, \$4 billion to \$6 billion, to build 4.2 miles of highway in New York. But it really is not a highway that is being built; it is landfill that is being built.

Now, it can be said that since this money comes from the highway trust fund it does not affect the deficit. But

that is not true because money coming from the highway trust fund creates outlays just as any other money does and certainly affects the deficit.

So that no matter how you look at it, this is a very significant commitment that is being made.

Someone might say, "Why are you opposing a project that is in New York?" The reason is that this is a raid on the highway trust fund that will affect every single one of your States. I would add that the amendment is strongly supported by the Member, Mr. WEISS, in whose district the entire project would be. According to the Department of Transportation's 1985 interstate cost estimate, this would cost around \$416 million per mile and about \$15,000 per inch. The entire project would exceed New York's share of the highway trust fund moneys, which would be about \$1.7 billion over the life of the project, over the 10-year period. That would not cover then the 90-percent Federal share of the cost even at the \$2.3 billion estimated by the Federal Highway Administration.

So that the money would have to come from other States, other areas, or we would have to increase taxes to increase the highway trust fund to be able to pay for this project. It could not come from New York's existing share of the highway trust fund. It can also be asked: Why should we be telling New York how to use its highway trust fund money? Well, it is important, I think, to point out that this is not a highway project; it is a public works project. It is a landfill project.

Of the 227 acres of landfill proposed by this project, only 36 acres are for highway use, 97 acres are for commercial use, 94 acres are for parks, and if you do not believe me, listen to Judge Griesa who has enjoined proceeding with this highway. He said, and I quote, that Westway is not needed for transportation purposes. He said even the Corps of Engineers agreed that a highway could be built along the existing rights-of-way on West Street and 12th Avenue at a cost of only about \$50 million, and here we are talking about \$4 to \$6 billion for this program.

It is a clear violation of the 1981 Federal Highway Act which says, and I quote:

Funds shall be limited to the construction necessary to provide a minimum level of acceptable service on the Interstate System.

That is what the highway trust fund is intended to be for, that is what these funds are intended to be used for; not to produce a massive landfill.

Now, finally, it can be said that this is an authorizing committee matter. It is not. It is a straight limitation on an appropriations bill which is certainly within the jurisdiction of this committee. It is not a deauthorization bill. I know that Chairman HOWARD has a

deauthorization bill in, which I fully applaud.

All the amendment does is provide the stopgap necessary until that authorization can be enacted, and the Public Works Committee has full authority to do that.

□ 1345

But it is necessary because the court injunction that exists against Westway at the present time could be lifted at any time; it is being appealed on an expedited basis. But there are some \$300 million in contracts that are ready to be let to begin this \$6 billion potential expenditure from the highway trust fund.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COUGHLIN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COUGHLIN. If, once it proceeds, obviously, it is much more difficult to stop, and I hope that we will support this amendment, because it would provide the stopgap necessary to preclude the initiation of this project and to allow the authorizing committee, indeed, to act on the project.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] offered this amendment in the subcommittee, and offered it again in the full Appropriations Committee.

I opposed the amendment in the subcommittee, I opposed the amendment again in the full committee, and I am still opposed to the amendment because I do not believe this bill is the appropriate place to address this issue.

This project, aside from whether it is an authorization or appropriation, is supported by both the Governor of New York and the mayor of New York City, and it is also supported by both of the New York Senators.

I believe we should accept the judgment of the State and the local people in regards to opposing this amendment.

I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania—the ranking minority member of the subcommittee—and I reluctantly but strongly urge that this amendment be rejected. This is not the right place and not the right time.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has been noted by my colleagues, this project lies entirely within the confines of the 17th Congressional District in New York which I represent. It is an interstate highway proposal which would cover an area on the West Side of Manhattan from 42d Street down to the Battery; 4.2 miles.

However, this project has a very unsavory history. It goes back about 14 years; it has been challenged in the courts and on two separate occasions

now, Federal District Court Judge Griesa has ruled against the project because of unlawful, improper actions by the various State and Federal agencies and flaws in the environmental impact statement and in the permit process.

The opposition to this project is based on transportation, economic, and environmental grounds.

Why would a highway running 4.2 miles cost, under the Federal Highway Administration's estimate, \$2.3 billion? It would be the most expensive highway in the history of the world.

The reason it would cost that much is that this is not really a highway project. This is really a real estate boondoggle, if you will, posing as a highway project.

What they propose to do is to fill in some 200 acres of the Hudson River, put a tunnel inside that landfill and create prime real estate in midtown Manhattan. That is really what this whole thing is about.

The Corps of Engineers has indicated quite clearly that if you wanted to build a highway along the current right-of-way along West Street and 12th Avenue, you could do it for some \$50 million and have a very nice highway indeed; but that would not meet the requirements of the real estate and big money folk who are involved in pushing this project.

Now, what I and my constituents have supported is trading in this project under the urban mass transit legislation, so that you could take about \$50 million, spend it on a moderate, modest highway, and spend the rest of it; about \$1,700 million, on mass transit, on our subway systems, our buses, and our commuter rail lines which are really the lifeblood of New York; and on which all New Yorkers really depend—not only New Yorkers, but those who come into New York to work or for recreation purposes.

That is what makes sense; that is what we ought to have.

Now, let me tell you about the people who support and who oppose this project. My constituents, and indeed New Yorkers generally, on every poll and survey that has been taken, have expressed their opposition to this project and have expressed their support for trade-in.

The most recent survey that I took, sometime around February of this year, had 75 percent of my constituents who responded, and I got a very big response; asking not only this question but a number of other questions, expressed their opposition to the Westway interstate and supported the trade-in.

Of 63 elected officials who testified before the Corps of Engineers, 57 of them opposed this interstate highway, and supported a trade-in. Six officials support it; our two U.S. Senators sup-



port it; the Governor and the mayor, support it; and one or two other officials whom I do not know by name support it.

The current president of the city council; the incoming president of the city council; the current president of the Borough of Manhattan; the incoming president of the Borough of Manhattan, all oppose this project and opt for the trade-in.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WEISS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WEISS. Now, it seems to me that the way to save money for the Federal Government and the way to satisfy the needs of New York and New Yorkers is to adopt this amendment, so that the landfill portion of the project would be precluded for 1 year.

Our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD], has legislation, as does our distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI], which would permanently bar Federal reimbursement for the landfill portion of Westway; but we do not know when that legislation will actually reach the floor.

Now is the time to put a hold on the landfill, until the substantive legislation can get adopted. We will be striking a blow for environmental transportation and economic good sense. We will be done right by New York and New Yorkers, and we will be doing right by the people, the taxpayers of the United States of America.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I am pleased to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. WEISS, for his statement, and identify it in the following way: You see, sir, "I Love New York," as in all the signs that are seen.

(On request of Mr. CONYERS and by unanimous consent, Mr. WEISS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CONYERS. If the gentleman would continue to yield to me.

Mr. WEISS. I am delighted to yield to my friend.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, as one who goes there regularly, in the course of our business and I might even admit for pleasure, too, I have been hearing about this Westway for so long now it has become a national football in our subcommittees and in the press.

□ 1355

Can you cogently bring us to the heart of the matter? I mean, what has caused this thing to ever occur, in the first place?

Mr. WEISS. As I have indicated in my comments, I am convinced that the

purpose of this kind of landfill-tunnel-highway operation is not for the purpose of creating a better highway but for the purpose of creating prime real estate in midtown Manhattan on which luxury housing can be built.

Mr. CONYERS. We have had a lot of problems with prime real estate in midtown Manhattan. That is the subject of books and articles and quite a bit of discussion. But as one of those who has worn that badge, "I love New York," I think this is where the environmentalists, the people who like the city—and, by the way, I think the citizens of the city happen to be on this side of the argument; am I correct?

Mr. WEISS. The gentleman is quite correct. In every survey and poll that has been taken, the people of New York have said that they are opposed to the interstate and they want the money traded in for mass transit purposes.

Mr. CONYERS. Well, I cannot imagine anybody around here not siding with the people on the matter.

Westway is a shameful porkbarrel project and should be eliminated from the Federal budget.

Westway is a multibillion-dollar real estate venture masquerading as an interstate highway in New York City.

New York wants to build a 4-mile highway along the west side of Manhattan in the river. It will cost \$1 billion a mile—but they don't really want a road. What they want is more Manhattan Island for real estate development. Building a road is just the way in which the supporters of this boondoggle get the Federal Government to pay for their big dreams and what could be our tremendous mistake.

I've heard it said by some that they would like to unite the States of New York and New Jersey by paving over the Hudson River.

Westway will cost the American taxpayers an estimated \$4 to \$6 billion, for a 4.2-mile highway. That is \$1 billion a mile—or \$15,000 an inch. With this price, it is the most expensive highway project ever built. We are in serious trouble in this country if we can't provide roads for our automobiles at less than \$1 billion a mile. Let's face it; we could pave it with gold and have it cost less.

It is an environmental disaster. Countless hours of research and studies, including one even by the Army Corps of Engineers, has said that there are superior alternatives.

Westway is a misuse of limited tax dollars, especially in these times of spiraling budget deficits. Money to build Westway will come from the Federal highway trust fund, which was intended to finance the building and repair of the Nation's roads, not for creating real estate in a river.

So all in all, Westway seems like a ludicrous project to me. It costs too much, is an environmental debacle, and there are much better and socially responsible ways to spend the money.

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I join the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee in suggesting that this is the wrong bill on which to raise this issue. The chairman of the Public Works Committee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD], has made it very clear that he intends to give the Westway issue full ventilation when his bill comes to the floor. That ventilation will permit alternative approaches to the problem, such as that of the gentleman from New Jersey, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI], and others, to be offered in a way that they cannot under the limited exemption from the rule that has been granted by the Rules Committee to consider the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. And, indeed, some alternative is needed. Everyone acknowledges that if we do not build Westway, we must have something else to take its place. Yet by considering the Westway issue under the present circumstances, we deny ourselves the opportunity to look at what those alternatives are and to see whether they really are better than what the city of New York and the State of New York have proposed to do.

Let me emphasize that this highway is approved and has been approved by successive mayors of the city of New York and is supported by the present mayor of the city of New York, who just won renomination overwhelmingly in a Democratic primary yesterday; that is supported by the Governor of the State of New York, as it has been by past Governors, and that it is supported by both of the Members of the other body from the State of New York.

I do not deny that the project is controversial, but I think it should be very clear that it has wide support within the State and city of New York.

I do not want to dwell at length on the substance of the issue because, as I say, I think that should be left—as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] has suggested in his "Dear Colleague" to us, which I hope all the Members have read—to the work of his committee, when his bill comes on the floor. In view of the comments that have been made, I do think the Members should know a little bit about the history of this project.

This project was approved by the U.S. Department of Transportation in the Ford administration under the aegis of Secretary of Transportation William Coleman. I have gone through a variety of court tests.

Mention has been made of the decision of the district judge, but it was

not mentioned that on most of what he decided the first time around, he was overruled by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which remanded to him to decide on a single issue. He has now decided that single issue, not to anyone's surprise, against the project. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has heard the case on an expedited basis, and that is now pending before the court of appeals. Obviously, no one here today has given the kind of review to this project that the court of appeals has, and I do not think Members of this body ought to try to pass judgment on the issues that are now pending before the court.

Mention has been made that somehow this is going to affect the budget. But I think the arguments of my colleague from New York, Mr. WEISS, make it clear that this had nothing to do with the deficit. If we do not get the highway money as a result of the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, then we are entitled to trade in for mass transit money. So it is really a question of which pocket the money is coming out of, whether it is going to be the right Federal pocket or the left Federal pocket, and the net amount of outlays with which the gentleman from Pennsylvania is concerned is going to be the same. So there is no change whatever in the deficit.

Now, both the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] seem to suggest that there is something unusual or novel or unique in the fact that this project, which will be a depressed highway and, in part, a covered highway, will utilize the air rights over the highway for a number of purposes, including park and housing.

Now, surely, there is nothing unusual in the fact that people build parks in connection with highways. In fact, the parkway is a typical form of highway in this country, and the fact that because of our limited and land availability, we put the park over the highway instead of alongside it surely should not prevent us from proceeding as we propose to do.

As for using air rights for other kinds of development, let me say that I had occasion to drive to Cambridge, MA, this last weekend, and in the course of that, I drove on Highway 20, the Massachusetts Turnpike.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GREEN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREEN. And, lo and behold, as I drove along, there at one point was a supermarket built across the highway, on top, of course, and there, another mile on, was a motel built across the air rights on top of the highway. In

New York City, anyone who has crossed the George Washington Bridge knows that there are four apartment towers on the air rights above the approaches to the George Washington Bridge. Those of you who have visited Gracie Mansion are aware, perhaps, of the fact that the East River Drive, the FDR Drive, run under Gracie Mansion and its adjacent grounds.

What we are doing is not unusual, and the idea that this represents some sort of unique real estate boondoggle is most mistaken. In fact, under the law, if we dispose of any of the real estate, the Department of Transportation has to approve of that, and the U.S. Government gets 90 percent of the proceeds.

So, certainly, there should be no objection about doing that.

So much for the substance of this matter. I would simply suggest that you cannot save a penny by passing this amendment, because if we trade in, you have to pay it out to us in mass transit funds, and I would also suggest there is nothing very unusual in using the air space over highways for other purposes.

But let me turn to what I hope will be the basis of your judgment today, and that is whether we ought to consider this on an appropriation bill.

Now, the general excuse of those who offer limitations on appropriation bills is that the authorizing committee has not given them an opportunity to bring to the floor of the House the issue with which they are concerned—most typically, I suppose, in recent years, the abortion issue.

The usual excuse for offering such an amendment on an appropriation bill is that there has been, and will be, no opportunity for the House as a whole to consider the matter otherwise.

In the present case, that is plainly not accurate. The fact of the matter is, as everyone acknowledges, that the Public Works Committee intends to deal with the Westway issue in this year's surface transportation authorization legislation. And we have every expectation, and the word of the chairman of that distinguished committee, that this measure will be on the floor before very long, so that you will have ample opportunity, whatever your views, to debate and to consider and ultimately to vote on the Westway issue. And I submit that by waiting until the Public Works Committee brings us this issue, you will be able to do it under far better circumstances than you can today, because you will then have an opportunity to consider alternatives which cannot be offered under the limited exemption from the rules under which the Coughlin amendment is brought to us, and you will therefore have an opportunity to compare what the alternatives are—

something you have not been given today.

There are some of us who feel that the alternatives have their weaknesses, too, problems of meeting air quality standards, for example. But we shall have full opportunity to debate that when the surface transportation bill comes to us.

I therefore ask that you join the members of the Public Works Committee who have written to you asking you to oppose the Coughlin amendment; I ask you to join in the majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee who voted down the Coughlin amendment, and most of them, I believe, because we felt this was the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee and not our jurisdiction, that of the Appropriations Committee.

I hope that you will join us and defer this matter until the Public Works Committee is able to bring this matter to us in a full and open forum where we can explore it fully, compare the alternatives, and then reach a reasonable decision.

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the construction of Westway as presently constituted but certainly want to see a highway built on the West Side of New York, one that would be economically feasible and one that would allow New York to solve its transportation problems in accordance with our national policy, which means the ailing subway system and the bus system would have trade-in funds whereby they would receive an assurance of \$1.7 billion.

We all love New York. But I think that it is more important to focus on our national policies and question what it means to our Nation.

When this highway was first authorized, there were not the fiscal concerns that we have today. We were not in an era of \$200 billion deficits or approaching a \$2 trillion debt ceiling. Our debt service was nowhere what it is today.

If we look at our fiscal responsibilities, which is what this argument is all about, as well as national transportation and environmental questions, we know that if we are irresponsible, reprehensibly irresponsible in fiscal policy and fiscal sanity, we are only going to create damage to the future of our country and our security.

What does a debt mean? It means that in years to come, young people will not get student loans; it means that the infrastructure and bridges will not be built in cities throughout our country; it means that veterans will not get health services.

Do we want to give a blank check for the construction of a 4.2-mile highway



that will cost more than the 2,800 miles of Interstate 80 in all its totality? Do we want to start a highway that we may not be able to complete, where the Interstate Trust Fund would only go until 1990 unless there is an extension, make a commitment that if the cost overruns are anything like the sewage plant they have in the Hudson River a few miles up the way, where it started off at \$200 million, and is now \$1.1 billion and still not open. Do we want to get into that kind of a bag, to keep doling out money from a trust fund and weakening the security of that fund, and reducing the money that other States and other projects will get in years to come? And do we want to run the risk of starting a highway that we may not have the funds to complete, a highway that will take 10 or 15 years and disrupt New York? Do we want to build a highway that TED WEISS, as a congressman, objects to having built in his own district. He said 75 percent of the people object to it even the mayor of the city, when he sat in Congress, objected to it.

Almost every city-elected official objects to it except Mayor Koch, who reversed himself. Bob Moses, who was a builder of great fame in New York, said we do not need a raceway on the West Side of New York. He said it would be a physical and financial catastrophe.

Do the people who live in the area know more than we do in Arizona and California and in other areas, and are we to respect their wishes? Are we to impose upon them a highway which is really not an interstate highway. When President Eisenhower started the interstate highway program, it was part of national security, and the moving of goods and people across the Nation. That is why we started the interstate highway program. It did not even conceive of 4.2 miles in the middle of Manhattan, which is not connected with any other part of the highway program.

So the illogic of the situation really cries out. We would need a ventilation system because of the 6 lanes going under the Hudson River, that would have to be maintained for decades and that alone would create a burdensome cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GUARINI was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GUARINI. And even the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, our good, competent, able chairman, in his "Dear Colleague" letter of May 16, had said that the highway was "a misuse of the highway trust fund."

And I go on and quote:

Who amongst us, especially those who represent crowded urban districts, would not like to see our cities expanded by 234 acres for additional development. New York officials found a way to do it. Unfortunately, that kind of a project is not a proper use of the highway trust fund.

□ 1410

That comes from the chairman of the committee who authorized it. Let me say, coming from New Jersey, there would be flooding along the river, and into the Meadowlands where there is huge development underway. There is no question Westway's landfill would have an impact on the rise of the Hudson River.

You are paving over, 600 feet on average, into the Hudson River. The environmental question from paving one of our major waterways on the juvenile bass population in the river means that a \$200-million fishing industry will be imperiled. The other question of stirring up toxic wastes demands your attention. There is not one reason, there are many reasons why we should not proceed. We in New Jersey want the best for our regional planning; we want the best for New York. We want to be good partners, but we cannot have foisted upon us a highway that is going to be a landfill, a real estate developer's dream, and impose it and have an adverse effect on the State of New Jersey.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUARINI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement and on his support of this important amendment. I want to underscore a point which I think he made at the beginning of his statement.

There has been some allusion by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] that in fact whether it is the highway that is constructed or there is a trade in for mass transit, it is the same amount of money that is involved. I want to correct that and underscore the gentleman's statement about it.

If you have a trade in, the amount of the trade in is limited at the most to the interstate cost estimate at the time that the request for the trade in is made. At this point, that is \$2.3 billion.

Mr. GUARINI. We know how much it will cost our country.

Mr. WEISS. That is right. If you have a highway the Federal Government is obligated to a blank check reimbursement of 90 percent of whatever the final cost of that highway is, and as the gentleman has indicated, with the cost overruns, this project could cost anywhere from \$4 to \$10 billion. Nobody knows the difference.

Finally, there has been some suggestion about people who support this project. Well, I want to state for the Record that the two U.S. Senators in fact have been consistent in support. The current Governor has in fact been consistent in his support of the project.

My distinguished friend, the mayor of the city of New York, when he was in this House, with me he led that opposition to the Westway project and supported trade in. He changed his position after he was first elected. The distinguished former Governor, Mr. Carey, campaigned for the first time that we went out for the governorship in opposition to this project and switched his position after he was elected.

So it seems to me that with that background and the peoples' opposition to this highway and the local elected officials, the gentleman's position is absolutely sound.

Mr. GUARINI. I would like to say that we may not get another chance to vote on this bill. The Circuit Court of Appeals could foreseeably today overrule Judge Griesa who had extended hearings in the Federal District Court, Southern District of New York. If that happens, \$300 million worth of contracts that are sitting on the desk of Mayor Koch and Governor Cuomo could be let out immediately. I am informed by Mitchell Bernard who is the attorney for the environmentalists and the people who brought the action to deauthorize the building of Westway, has told me that they will not have time for an appeal. So this vote is a critical vote.

If you lose this opportunity to vote, the letting out of the contracts tomorrow morning if the Circuit Court of Appeals reversed it today, may bar forever your opportunity to act. The other bill that you will be considering that has been put into the hopper may not come up until next year. We will pass the point of no return. The 90-day extension that has been talked about for trade in would become moot and unnecessary so your vote now is vital. You must stand up now for fiscal responsibility, for the betterment of your environment, for national transportation policy which is sensible. Your vote can assure that we will not have 4 miles of highway that would further impact and gridlock the traffic in New York, that we will have a comprehensive public and private transportation system for this city and for the region which we will not have unless we become responsive in those areas. Unless we do the right thing today, we may forever lose our chance.

We have been generous with New York. New York will get \$1.7 billion in trade in. They cannot be heard to complain. I am asking you to recognize the fact that any excesses on the part

of New York would go to the disadvantage of the rest of the 49 States. So please, recognize that this is our last chance; we may not have another opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI] has expired.

(On request of Mr. GREEN and by unanimous consent, Mr. GUARINI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUARINI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to the gentleman first, that he knows because he was a very successful lawyer, that if the Court of Appeals should decide today—

Mr. GUARINI. Flattery will really not receive any votes.

Mr. GREEN [continuing]. There will be a request for a hearing, and in fact, there will be an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court—

Mr. GUARINI. There will not be time.

Mr. GREEN [continuing]. And there will be plenty of opportunity to get stays beyond this point.

Mr. GUARINI. Has the gentleman spoken with the attorneys? Because the attorneys know that \$300 million of letting of contracts could end the whole discussion within 24 hours.

Mr. GREEN. Not if there was a stay granted while all these other things are going on.

Let me say the gentleman mentioned a moment ago the desire for good regional planning. I would simply point out that at the time this highway was planned, the regional highway planning agency was the Tristate Regional Transportation Committee on which the State of New Jersey was represented. I would point out that this highway, Westway, was approved by the Tristate Regional Planning Commission including the New Jersey Commissioners.

Mr. GUARINI. But not as an interstate highway, because that is the difference.

Mr. GREEN. I do not think it is the difference, because if you are worried about traffic impact, if you are worried about whether to trade in for mass transit or not, if you are worried about impact on the Hudson River, these were all issues that were before the Tristate Regional Planning Commission in their role as the transportation planning agency for the area.

Mr. GUARINI. The New York partnership was the strongest proponent of this highway for the redevelopment and the employment of New York because they were in a state of bankruptcy and it was very important that New

York be given help. But that is not the same any more. Times have changed.

Mr. GREEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not talking about the New York partnership. I am talking about the Tristate Regional Planning Commission. The Commissioners appointed by the Governor of New Jersey. This was the officially designated highway planning agency for the region and the New Jersey Commissioners for this highway, this Westway.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems like this is *deja vu*. It was some 10 years ago that we had similar arguments. The proposition then of the Westway was supported by Governor Carey, by Major Beam, by all of labor, and a whole host of important and responsible and credible organizations. Had we started then, it would have been completed and it would have cost us considerably less. What we are concerned about if this amendment is passed, we will have no Westway, we will have no time for trade in. That is because the time expires on September 30. It is a 1-year bill, and all that will be required, all that will result is a delay. A 1-year delay and then there will be a new effort. The cost of this construction will go up.

I guess I have the advantage of some; I am a little bit older than some of the opponents and some of the proponents. But I remember when the East River Drive was proposed. There was a similar hue and cry. Environment was not the issue because we all knew that the East River had a stench that was comparable to Chanel in the extreme opposite. But there was hue and cry: Dislodging residences; disturbing businesses; enriching developers. Nothing is new. It is the same old story. Yet, without the East River Drive, New York, Manhattan town would choke. So be it with the Westway.

When Moses made his original observation that was a long, long time ago. He did not contemplate the growth of traffic coming along the West Side. I travel that West Side every day. I know how important it is with tens of thousands of other motorists who use that West Side as transportation. That should be enhanced and should be rebuilt or built anew. So these are not the arguments; these are not the arguments.

□ 1420

Remember that. That was controversial. New York was the ogre. People from all over the country looked and said, "The devil with New York. That is the cesspool of our Nation." Happily, wiser heads prevailed and the loan guarantee legislation was enacted. We had the support of then-President

Carter. New York was saved. New York prospered and banks throughout the country were saved because they had New York securities.

Today, 10 years later, we must again call upon the wisdom of the House to reject what I will refer to as "Drop Dead, New York—Part II," or the Coughlin amendment.

Pending before us is an amendment which has as its intention, and if adopted will in fact, kill the Westway interstate highway project at least for a year. Yes, ladies and gentleman, Westway could be killed, not by a court, or even by the committee which has jurisdiction over it. No Westway would be killed by a punitive, discriminatory amendment attached to an appropriations bill. Is that right? I say no, and I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

As the chairman of the authorizing committee has said in his "Dear Colleague" letter of today, the Coughlin amendment is a backdoor legislative maneuver. I ask my colleagues to put themselves in our shoes. How would you feel if an effort was undertaken on the floor to knock out by an amendment a vitally important highway in your district?

Let me assure my colleagues that if we pass this amendment today, that could happen. Do not view this as being our problem. I promise you it will be your problem because it will set the precedent that will allow amendments, no matter how ill-founded, to make it to the House floor for votes, and with it could ride the fate of a project in your district.

The supporters of this amendment will regale you with lists of those who are opposed to this project. Let me recite some additional supporters of this Westway undertaking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BIAGGI] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BIAGGI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BIAGGI. The President of the United States, the AFL-CIO, just to name a couple in addition to the others I have mentioned.

This project is not just a transportation project. It is a catalyst for meaningful economic development along the west side of Manhattan, and if you have not been there, let me suggest you go there and see it. It is the dregs and it should be rehabilitated. It will provide additional housing, additional businesses.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me about the dregs of my district that he is talking about?

Mr. BIAGGI. No, I will not yield on that point. I have not yielded the gentleman any time. At the conclusion of my comments, I will be delighted to yield to you.



MR. WEISS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BIAGGI. It is the typical waterfront area. It has been upgraded somewhat, but it deserves better. It is a sound investment of the Federal dollar and will produce a solid return. Tens of thousands of people will be working. The construction industry will be working on that Westway for some 10 years.

I urge opposition to this amendment. People talk about the environmental impact. I remember the snail darter that held up a dam that was 90-percent completed for 6 or 7 or 8 years. It is unimportant. They said the snail darter is an endangered species if we continue to build this dam and permit it to function. The courts and reason finally prevailed, and what happened? They removed the snail darter, took it to another place, and snail darters are all over the place. They have multiplied and they are as prolific as the flies in New Jersey.

I am not so sure that these arguments are all that meaningful. Let us use common sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BIAGGI] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. WEISS and by unanimous consent, Mr. BIAGGI was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BIAGGI. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman concede that, as the Member representing the area, that I spend at least as much time in that area as the gentleman does?

Mr. BIAGGI. I would clearly say so.

Mr. WEISS. All right. Then I would like to suggest to the gentleman, as one who really is familiar with that area, that what has been happening over the course of the last 10 years is a tremendous upgrading of the area in spite of the threat of Westway coming in, and indeed, the estimate now of developers in the area is that what is holding back development is that threat of Westway coming in.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply point out that the area where we propose to build Westway is out to the pier and bulkhead line where the piers are rotting away and are a danger to navigation as they break up and go out into the water, and that indeed, as my colleague from Manhattan. Mr. Weiss, has said, there has been a good deal of

development in the area. It is residential development and thus the desire on the part of the city to create parks atop the highway, as others in Seattle and New Jersey and elsewhere have had parks atop highways.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BIAGGI] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BIAGGI was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I conceded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS], my colleague for whom I have great affection and respect, but there has been some improvement. I know that. We all know it. We live in New York. But there is no question in my mind that we still have areas there that I would consider the dregs and would be susceptible to improvement, an improvement that would naturally follow if the Westway would come into effect, an improvement of the whole area economically.

There would be developers who would come forward and, yes, I object, and I agree with the gentleman, to having huge skyscrapers border the waterfront. I object to that vigorously. But I understand that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD], has a plan that will permit the Westway to go forward with some modification, and that one I would agree with.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in very strong support of the amendment that has been offered by my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI] to prevent Federal highway trust fund money from being spent on the Westway landfill.

Let me say at the outset that I do not sit on the committees that have direct jurisdiction over this project and therefore ordinarily I would hesitate to become this directly involved in the debate. But I do serve on the Committee on the Budget and I rise out of a very keen memory of the anguishing hour upon anguishing hour that the Budget Committee invested this past year in attempting to address the Federal deficit crisis that we are facing.

Indeed, I know that the Federal budget deficit is a matter of concern to all the Members of this body, and not just those of us on the Budget Committee.

□ 1430

The fact of the matter is that all of us have been forced to go back to our own congressional districts to ask our constituents for some very significant sacrifices, in terms of cuts in a number of critical program areas. I recall in my own instance among the hard decisions that have been most critical for

my State were urban development action grant funding reductions, economic development assistance reductions, and mass transit reductions. Those were not choices that were easy to make for any of us.

I submit that, particularly because of the difficulty of those choices, this is 1 year in which we need to be very careful about providing the kind of blank check that is being requested in this Westway project. We should proceed with extreme caution in the face of the horrendous expenditure of funds that is contemplated in this instance.

The project is being described as a highway project, and, therefore, it is to be funded out of the highway trust fund. Yet it is clear, both from the debate and even the discussion by some of the sponsors of the project, that it is far more than that. Westway entails real estate development of a substantial magnitude. In fact, most of the money will be going not to the building of a highway, but to landfill which, we are told, will enhance economic development.

Furthermore, the use of the highway trust fund money is limited by law for "construction necessary to provide a minimum level of acceptable service on the Interstate System." It is hard to imagine how this 200-acre landfill project could fit that description, especially since the Army Corps of Engineers itself considers Westway to be a "nonessential" part of the interstate program.

Finally, we are told that the total cost of this project could run as high as \$4 to \$6 billion, a cost that would work out to some billion dollars a mile or some \$15,000 a linear inch. Does this really make any kind of sense?

As I said earlier, this is a difficult budget year, a particularly difficult budget year for all of us. But I submit that this is not a project that ought to be a close question even if it were not a difficult budget year. The economics do not pan out. The protection for the taxpayer is not there. We are being asked to go forward on an essentially open-ended commitment to a project that is absurdly expensive and is outside the scope of the trust fund authorization. I feel that Congress has a responsibility to prevent a mistake of these proportions from occurring.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLPE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his courtesy in yielding, and I would like to make just a couple of points in response to the gentleman.

First, if you look at the amount per capita that New York State has drawn out of the highway trust fund, you can hardly blame the Federal deficit on

that. We happen to be right at the bottom of the States at the present time in terms of per capita assistance from the highway trust fund, probably because of the fact that our major cross-State highway, the New York State Thruway, was completed just before President Eisenhower announced the Interstate Highway Program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] has expired.

(On request of Mr. GREEN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WOLPE was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, even if Westway is funded, we are only going to be in the middle of the list. Certainly you cannot blame New York State for the deficit in terms of its use of highway trust funds, and I think to pick on this one project simply because it has been tied up in litigation over these years is most unfair.

Nor would I suggest to the gentleman is what we have done in seeking to build a depressed and partly covered highway unusual. In the gentleman's State of Michigan, for example, I am told that the Federal Highway Administration permitted the depressing of a highway and the covering of a highway where, for strict highway purposes, it was not needed, so that two parts of an Orthodox Jewish community could stay in contact with each other over the Sabbath. Yet that, although not a highway purpose strictly, has been permitted in the past by the Federal Highway Administration.

In New Jersey a highway has been depressed, and it was covered over in order to preserve the ambience of a park. There has been a park created in Seattle under similar circumstances.

As I indicated earlier in the debate, another highway, the Massachusetts Turnpike, has used air rights for a supermarket and a motel. We are doing nothing unusual in this.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time to respond to the gentleman from New York, I am not suggesting that New York has taken undue advantage of highway trust funds up to this point or that it is not perfectly free to use highway trust funds in a way that has been authorized by law. The problem is that the total amount of money that was set aside for New York over the duration of the project is some \$1.7 billion, and yet the estimated cost of the project is coming in at anywhere from \$4 billion to \$6 billion.

Who is to pick up that extra cost? How is that financing to be accomplished?

As far as the comparison with the Michigan project in the past and projects in which more than simply highway construction has been per-

mitted, the fact of the matter is that the Westway project, as it has been contemplated, would be more than twice as expensive per mile as any other interstate segment ever built. I submit that Westway is a different ballgame and—without taking anything away from the important and worthwhile construction projects on which New York has embarked in the past—I submit that this project simply falls outside of the scope of what is financially justified.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLPE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to commend the gentleman on his statement, and I suggest, just in fairness and so the record is straight here, that according to the Department of Transportation, since 1956 for every dollar collected from the highway trust fund in New York, New York has received back \$1.13. Specifically, the figures are that New York State's payments into the highway trust fund were \$7,141,000,000 since 1956, and New York State received back \$8,100,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WOLPE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOLPE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say just for the record that New York has not been treated unfairly in this. As we look at the expenditures of the highway trust fund, they have received more than their fair share.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I would like to make one additional comment before I yield further to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York. This matter has been subject, as the gentleman knows, to considerable litigation. As the gentleman knows, several courts have viewed as questionable the procedures that led to the approval of this project. I submit the fact of the litigation itself ought to give all of us in this body additional cause to proceed cautiously in moving forward with the project.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point.

Mr. WOLPE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, anyone can litigate, and district judges can make mistakes. In this instance the district judge issued a sweeping decision on Westway on which he was overruled on just about every point but one and one which the findings of the court of appeals were much nar-

rowed from what the district judge had found. It went back, the district judge has now made another ruling, and the court of appeals, whatever it is going to decide, thought the case was worthy enough that it granted an expedited appeal and has heard argument.

That decision will be what that decision will be. I do not purport to represent to the gentleman what it will be. If the decision is that the dredge and fill permit, which was the last step that will have to be taken, was improperly granted, that will be the decision, and there is nothing we in this body will do to change it, as far as I can imagine.

At the same time I would say to the gentleman that if the court rules otherwise, this highway will have met every environmental requirement, and it is not at all clear that the alternative of a land highway at surface level can do that. There are very serious Clean Air Act problems with that, which is why the people went to this mode of construction in the first place. So you may well be throwing a very serious monkey wrench into the transportation planning.

If I may make just one further point, again the highway trust fund at this point is in surplus, not in deficit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] has expired.

(On request of Mr. GREEN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WOLPE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think it is as wrong to look to the highway trust fund to solve the deficit problem when it is not creating the problem as I thought earlier this year it was wrong to look to the—

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, the point is not that the highway trust fund is adding to the deficit at this point in time. The point is that this project will definitely add to the deficit over the long term.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLPE. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York, in whose district this project is located and who is telling us that the vast majority of his own constituents oppose this project and believe there is a much better way to proceed.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and again I want to underscore the very last point the gentleman made.

New York City is crying out desperately to keep its transportation lifeline open, that is, its mass transit system, its subway system, and its bus system. We have a need identified already for 10 additional billion dollars, and



nobody knows where it is coming from. We have a chance, by trading in this project, to get up to \$1,700,000,000 for that mass transit system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. WEISS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WOLPE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOLPE. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. Instead, Mr. Chairman, we are being told that because the highway trust fund is not in deficit, it is perfectly appropriate to spend the obscene amount of money, even if it is a conservative estimate, of \$2.3 billion on 4 miles of highway. Whether it is in my district or in anybody else's district, that kind of expenditure cannot be justified.

Let me make one final point with the gentleman on the agreement or the approval. We have just gotten word as to the decision in the circuit court of appeals. The circuit court affirmed the decision of the district court judge as to the defects in the environmental impact statement, reversed it as to the permanent injunction, and remanded the matter back to the Federal defendant. So, it seems to me that since the matter is pending, it is all the more important for this amendment to be adopted to keep things in status quo until there is an opportunity for the legislation of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] or the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI] to take effect.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the Coughlin amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this Westway project has been the victim of just about every failing of government, every failure of the administrative process, and every failure of the judicial process that the mind of man can conjure up. If it had been built a decade ago, when it was first proposed or when the plans were first ready, it would have cost a substantially smaller portion of what it would cost to build today.

This project, with the delays from the litigation and the appeals and the painful reevaluations all the way up along the line, has suffered the fate of other projects that affect the environment, of utilities, and of other major projects. They have been bogged down in such a morass of administrative appeals and judicial actions that it becomes almost impossible to go ahead with any major urban improvement program.

Now, here we are with New York City having this glorious waterfront asset that any other city in the world would have been holding international

architectural competitions on to find the most imaginative and creative design with which to improve that beautiful waterfront asset. You can look at cities that have done this. You can look at London and Paris and Sydney, Australia, and you can look at Rio de Janeiro and Hong Kong, where they have thoughtfully maximized the potential for beauty and for relaxation and leisure time with their waterfront assets—one of the most precious urban assets a city can have.

But here our waterfront is treated in this manner and has been cast upon the development slag heap, left abandoned in a disgraceful, decrepit, crumbling, unsafe condition. It is ridiculous.

We are going to have budget problems until every Member of this Congress goes to the great Congress in the sky. We are going to have problems of mass transportation from now until hell freezes over. Is this waterfront project to develop this glorious urban resource in New York City going to be held hostage to the U.S. budget problem that we are going to have to live with for the next generation? Is it going to be held hostage to the proclivity of otherwise thoughtful and enlightened citizen groups, environmental groups, and consumer groups to use the courts and to use the administrative process to obfuscate, to delay, and to confuse until these development projects are drowned in a sea of delay?

□ 1445

I say that we ought to go ahead with this project. This project has been a victim of our failing judicial, administrative and legislative processes. This project is a classic case of where the perfect is the enemy of the good. This may not be a perfect project, but it is a damn good project. It will be a beautiful enhancement of the city of New York.

I urge this amendment be defeated.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. I thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

As the gentleman has indicated, this project has been in and out of the courts, and as my colleague from New York indicated and my office has advised me of the same thing, we now have a decision affirming in part, reversing in part, and not permanently enjoining the project, but obviously since it has been remanded there is going to be the possibility of more litigation and certainly the project cannot go through without it.

Would the gentleman not agree with me that until the Members of this body have had a chance to learn what is in the court's decision and since it is

obvious that given the little we know about it that the project is not going forward instantly that we would be better advised to wait until the Public Works Committee has brought this matter before us, as it will be doing in a couple weeks, rather than proceeding under circumstances where we really do not know what the court has decided at the present time.

Mr. SCHEUER. I am in total agreement with my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SCHEUER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. GUARINI. I think many of us would like to see the matter brought to formality. There has been so much uncertainty over the last 14 years and, of course, the costs do go up all the time.

I would like to bring out a point and that is that frequent reference has been made to urban development programs. This is a highway bill, taking moneys from the Highway Trust Act. I just would like to remind the gentleman, as much as we would like to see the development in New York, that it should not be by way of the highway trust fund.

The 1981 Highway Trust Act states: "Funds shall be limited to a minimum level of accepted service on an interstate system."

That does not mean real estate development or sky-rise residential or commercial development or paving over the Hudson River.

Mr. SCHEUER. Well, we are not trying to pave over the Hudson River, but this project does provide on a non-profit basis quite a rich intermixture of community projects, of civic projects, of leisure time projects, and it will be a beautiful amenity to the city of New York if only we can pry it loose.

Mr. GUARINI. But contrary to the purpose of the court, of the highway trust fund, the interstate highway trust fund.

Mr. SCHEUER. No; the basic guts of this project is a highway, but we have in a rather creative way, I think, added on to the periphery in effect of this some beautiful amenities for the city of New York.

Now, it is basically a highway project, but there are a large number of parks, playgrounds, delightful amenities that are going to enhance the quality of life in New York.

I disagree most thoroughly with my colleagues from New York that the citizens of the West Side will not

enjoy this use. They will enjoy it more than any other citizens of New York, the folks who live within a 5- or 10-minute walk of this project.

Mr. GUARINI. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCHEUER. Of course, I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. GUARINI, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHEUER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GUARINI. Judge Griesa of the Federal District Court for the Southern District of New York had indicated that it was not a highway development program in the findings of his decision, but, in fact, was a real estate development.

He also pointed out that New York could have that same 6-lane highway on the same existing main part of Manhattan where it is now for \$50 million and that would adequately serve and we did not need one for \$2.3 billion.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GREEN. I think it should be pointed out, however, that if we build that surface highway, and I frankly doubt that it could be built for \$50 million, I think hundreds of millions is more likely; but the fact of the matter is that if we build a surface highway, we are barring not only the residents of Manhattan, but also all the visitors from access to the waterfront, because we will have a surface level highway which will then make it impossible for our people to have access to the Hudson River waterfront. It will be like a great wall there barring us from the waterfront. One of the advantages of the present Westway is that it does preserve access to the waterfront which will not exist with the gentleman's alternative.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I support the Guarini-Coughlin amendment, of which I am a cosponsor. The amendment stipulates that no funds in this act shall be used for the landfill portion of the proposed Westway highway project in New York City.

It has been my understanding that funds in the Transportation appropriations bill are intended to facilitate transportation not to finance real estate development. To my mind that suggests that all moneys in this bill should be spent for transportation-related facilities and activities.

The Westway project does provide for a 4.2-mile section of interstate highway. However, it also provides New York with 100 acres of prime real estate ready for development, at a probable cost of from \$4 to \$10 billion. That cost at any time should seem prohibitive. In light of the budget deficit, it verges on the obscene. On economic grounds alone, Westway must go.

The Westway project also uses funds that many New Yorkers, including our colleague Mr. WEISS, in whose district the project lies, believe would be for better used shoring up New York's public transit system and building a more modest highway.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join in opposing the Westway project by supporting this amendment.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Coughlin amendment. This amendment would not only preclude the construction of any interstate highway on the Lower West Side of Manhattan, it would eliminate any additional time for New York to pursue a trade-in for mass transit funds. Even Westway's most vocal opponents favor a trade-in of highway funds for money to be used for New York's subways.

Mr. Chairman, I have long been a proponent of Westway. I am convinced not only for the project's need, but of the soundness of the project as designed. The project has received all of the necessary permits and approvals from Federal agencies. It has been studied over and over and been found to be environmentally sound, fully complying with all Federal mandates and requirements for an interstate highway. Proposed alternatives have also been studied and have been found to have more adverse environmental impacts than the Westway project as now planned. Studies have not only indicated that these alternatives would violate Federal air quality standards, they would also create a greater burden on the national debt. The reason for this is that trade-in funds are derived from general revenues, whereas the proposed funding for the Westway project, would come from the highway trust fund. The highway trust fund is not funded by general revenues, but instead by gasoline and other road-related taxes.

However, even if I remained unconvinced of the project's legitimacy, I would still oppose the Coughlin amendment and so should all my colleagues in this House. If we permit this kind of arbitrary and discriminatory treatment against one State, then every State's project will be placed in jeopardy. If we ignore the dire infrastructure needs of one State, then no State's needs will be addressed. And if we strike down Westway altogether, we might as well abandon the policy objectives of the whole Interstate Highway System.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment. No State can afford the vulnerability this kind of precedent may impose on future State highway projects.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Coughlin-Guarini-Weiss amendment and commend my colleagues for their efforts to halt one of the greatest highway boondoggles ever seriously considered: New York's Westway. This important amendment would prevent any of the funds provided in this transportation appropriation bill to be used for the approval of—or to pay the salary of any person who approves the construction of a

landfill in the Hudson River as part of the Westway project.

There is no question that New York needs a refurbished highway on its West Side to help relieve its myriad transportation problems. However, I strenuously object to the attempt to use highway trust fund moneys to subsidize New York City's plan for real estate development—which is what the Westway project proposes.

In addition to being a 4.2-mile replacement for New York City's West Side Highway, the Westway project would provide a 224-acre landfill of the Hudson River upon which luxury high-rise apartments, private office towers and commercial industrial sites will be built.

The project is expected to take 10 to 15 years to complete and cost an estimated \$4 to \$6 billion. That translates to roughly \$15,000 an inch. With this price tag, Westway would become by far the most expensive highway in the world. This fact, in itself, would not be controversial, if it was clearly shown that the expenditure of \$4 to \$6 billion was absolutely necessary to replace the current West Side Highway. However, that is simply not the case. The fact is, there are viable alternative proposals which do not require that highway trust fund moneys be used for private real estate development.

Ninety percent of the cost of Westway would be paid for out of the highway trust fund because it has been designated as part of the interstate network of highway. However, according to the Federal Highway Act of 1981, the use of the highway trust fund moneys "shall be limited to the construction necessary to provide a minimum level of acceptable service on the Interstate Highway System." I do not believe that this Westway plan represents a minimum level of service. Nowhere in the 1981 act does it allow that highway moneys can be used for land development plans for private developers.

Constructing a less expensive highway along the existing waterfront and "trading-in" the remaining Federal highway funds to overhaul New York's crippled mass-transit system could give New York City both a safe highway and improved mass transit for a fraction of the cost of Westway.

Much has been made of the Westway "battle" between New York and New Jersey. However, opposition to Westway is not a regional issue as some would believe. If the Westway landfill is funded, Federal highway moneys that would otherwise go to many other States would be used instead on this single, mammoth project. Because the highway trust fund expires in 1990, Westway would need additional funds to complete the project. How will New York adequately finance future highway construction, improvements and road and bridge maintenance? The answer is obvious. Beginning construction of this Westway project now increases the likelihood of an American taxpayer bailout later.

The current configuration of Westway represents a raid on the highway trust



fund. Indeed, New York has legitimate transportation needs, but the Federal Government should not be in the business of providing highway moneys for private land development. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

□ 1500

#### QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred Members have appeared. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in strong opposition to the Coughlin amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a particularly mischievous and damaging amendment, and I earnestly appeal to my colleagues to vote it down right substantially.

It is a bad amendment, as Chairman HOWARD and I indicated in a brief "Dear Colleague" letter to Members late yesterday evening. It is bad transportation policy, grossly unfair to a single State, and a very dangerous precedent.

I would like to elaborate on our reasons, but before I do, there is one thing I think Members ought to grasp. It is that a vote against the Coughlin amendment cannot legitimately be considered a pro-Westway vote, not that some folks will not try to paint it that way, but that description will not stand up to the facts. I hope to make that clear as we go along.

For openers, the fact is that to the extent that there are problems with Westway, and there are, then there are ways to get at these problems. Environmental problems, as have been laid out today, are in the courts and apparently what we hear today is that that case has been remanded back to the district court level, but that is the proper forum now. Problems of cost, or of design, or of development impact, of transportation merits—there may be some of these. It depends on who you talk to. But here again, these are going to be taken care of through the authorization process. They are being addressed in pending legislation, H.R. 3129, and we expect

to be marking that up in the committee within the next few weeks.

The problem with the Coughlin amendment is that it recognizes none of this. It simply says that New York cannot build this interstate highway as currently designed, and I hope that my colleagues will listen carefully. It does not say only as designed, it says, in effect, that it cannot build any alternative interstate highway, even if redesigned to eliminate or reduce the problems on which much of the opposition to the current project has been based.

They talk about a surface highway. They talk today of an alternative, but this amendment eliminates any genuine alternatives along with the present project. It says if there is a problem with the project, junk it. Do not fix it up. Do not look for another way to do the job. Instead, scrap it and do not look for alternatives.

Is there a need? Do nothing. That is the effect of the Coughlin amendment.

The only option left to New York, an option that it already has under existing law, is to trade the project in for transit funding or for a non-Interstate highway alternative. That is no deal at all.

As to transit funding, it would not be in the form of guaranteed apportionments of highway trust fund dollars, but would be in the form of General Treasury revenues. The amount that they get would be a drop in the bucket in terms of New York's transit capital needs, and I wonder what kind of luck New York would have in getting appropriations out of the Appropriations Committee if the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, prevails with his amendment, which is supposedly based at least in part on grounds of cost.

If New York chooses a highway alternative on the trade-in provisions of existing law, the funding would be totally inadequate to the need. There has to be a better alternative. As I said a moment ago, the chairman of our committee has proposed one which is now incorporated in H.R. 3129, the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1985, which we are going to be marking up in early October.

The Coughlin amendment means bad transportation policy. Its anti-Westway supporters see it as a way to force New York to trade it in with most of the funds going for transit rather than for highway improvements.

It also singles out New York for treatment given no other city with a controversial interstate project. It would have Congress intervene by statute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SNYDER. This amendment would have Congress intervene by statute in the matter of a project which has gone through the process of local, State, and Federal approval with no viable alternative permissible. If this precedent is established via this amendment, then we cannot say with confidence that any project which can be made the subject of controversy in the future is safe at all, no matter if it has obtained all of the necessary approvals.

Mr. Chairman, we on the Public Works and Transportation Committee have considered the Coughlin amendment, at least in principle, in that it would do the same thing as H.R. 1888, the Guarini amendment, or the Guarini bill on which we took testimony, and we rejected it.

The efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] were rejected in the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee of which he is the ranking minority member, and in the full Committee on Appropriations. It should be similarly rejected here today on the floor, and I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me make another point or two. In the debate today, it has been indicated that the mayor of New York, when he was in the House, opposed the Westway. I think that is accurate.

But since he got to New York, and got to be mayor, he certainly has been apprised of the difficulties, and the problems, and he is no longer opposed to the Westway. Many of us, all of us in the political arena, I am sure, remember the campaign last year when he was proud to get on television with the President of the United States and accepted that big check for Westway. I think that is pretty much evidence of the fact that he is anxious to move on with it, and indicated in that television appearance how good this was.

Again, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the Coughlin amendment does not reduce spending, it does not save any money. In fact, it is a question of whether a project is funded out of the highway trust fund which has a balance around \$10 billion and has never contributed to the deficit since it was created in 1956, or whether or not you want to let them trade it in for mass transit, and then take it out of general revenues and put more pressure on the deficit.

I was rather amused at an earlier speaker who talked about the need to feed children, and take care of the veterans, and all of these things, all of

which we agree with. Certainly, there are these needs. But I have never yet heard of being able to do those things out of the highway trust fund. If, in fact, you defeat this project and Westway is traded in, New York will go after similar amounts of money—the gentleman from New York [Mr. Weiss] said \$1.7 billion, but I think there might be \$1.9 billion out of general revenues, in that neighborhood—I think then you are depriving those who are in need in those other categories of general funds.

Mr. Chairman, this is properly within the purview of the legislative committee, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. We are going to take that in the markup early in October. If an extension is needed by virtue of this court decision, it is on the program for tomorrow for markup, if they need us to put out a small bill to extend the time for trade-in.

Mr. Chairman, I urgently ask that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a few months ago, just before we recessed, I was criticized in a Utah newspaper for standing up here and talking about cost-sharing, and talking about the fact that people in this country ought to pay for the benefits they derive.

Now I am going to stand up here today because that newspaper in Utah said that Congressman SOLOMON was from New York, and all he wants is more and more and more money for New York, and he wants us out here in the far West to pay for everything that we get. Well, they were right in the first part, and on the second part they were wrong, because I am opposing this pork barrel project for New York State or New York City.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple and straightforward, but its passage will accomplish several important goals.

First, it will prohibit the expenditure of any funds under this act for the landfill in the Hudson River upon which the infamous Westway boondoggle is proposed to be built.

The arguments against the construction of Westway have been made and repeated countless times in the past several years.

The most highly respected environmental preservation organizations in the United States are united in opposition to the Westway landfill.

In addition, the National Taxpayers Union, one of the most effective groups in the Nation in campaigning against the squandering of scarce Federal tax dollars, is working vigorously in support of the Coughlin amendment.

The estimates as to the eventual cost to complete Westway are truly astounding even in these days of astronomical Federal budgets, and Federal deficits, I might add, as well.

The actual cost of Westway has been set at from \$4 to \$6 billion—which is about \$1 billion per mile, or more than \$15,000 per inch.

The sheer cost of the project is unjustifiable, and is more than ample ground for voting for the Coughlin amendment to prevent these massive expenditures.

Equally important, however, the Coughlin amendment is an antipork barrel amendment.

The Members of this House know of my active opposition over the years to all kinds of pork barrel projects—even those in my home State of New York.

As a New Yorker, I can tell all of you here this afternoon that this is pork of the first order.

There is simply no justification for such a massive expenditure for such an unneeded project.

I should also point out that the Coughlin amendment is a good Government amendment.

Its adoption will ensure that our limited highway trust fund resources are used in the manner for which they are truly intended—for highway construction.

Unless this amendment is approved, untold billions in highway construction funds will be used for real estate development.

It is no secret that the landfill proposed for Westway will be used for the construction of private real estate development, the financial benefit of which will fill the pockets of a very few multimillionaires real estate interests in New York City.

To prevent this abuse of limited highway funds, I appeal to my colleagues here this afternoon to stop Westway once and for all.

As a New Yorker and as a Member who has always opposed special interest pork barrelling, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Coughlin amendment.

I would appreciate it if my colleagues today would not look at the situation of holding off until next week and voting against another bill that would oppose it. Let us do it now and let us clear this legislation once and for all, and let us get back to good Government.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Dutchess County.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my colleagues that the gentleman in the well and I have districts that adjoin each other. I would say that we represent about two-thirds the length of the entire Hudson River, and I come down to

within 30 miles of the city of New York.

□ 1515

So my interest is with the commuters to the city who live in my District and the labor pool that would be gainfully employed with any expenditure of funds. I submit that the money we are talking about could be far better spent for the city of New York with improvements in its own mass transportation. Second, as far as my constituents who commute to the city daily, what they need is repairs on the metro-north and the commuter lines that get them to and from work in the city. They do not need Westway.

A less ambitious highway, I think, is appropriate. From the research I have done, the trade-in involved would be equivalent in the number of jobs produced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. GARCIA and by unanimous consent, Mr. SOLOMON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I come down in very strong support with what the gentleman in the well has said and associate myself with his remarks in favor of the Coughlin amendment.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to my colleague from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I think what has been said here, and I want to make it very clear to my colleagues that, not taking anything away from my other colleagues from the State of New York, but I hope that Members here do not think for one moment that because we are all from the State of New York that we agree on every issue. I want to make it very clear that there are those of us from the city of New York who have different views than those of us who represent the northern end of our State, which has very little to do with the city itself.

You can just as soon live in Indiana, or Massachusetts, or any other State, because it is a different philosophy. But just let me say, if I may, to all of my colleagues here this has been an issue that has been before us for many, many years, and I am hopeful that it will be resolved. I have heard that if you take Westway away we can take those moneys and put them into the subways. I would like very much to have our subways repaired. I think we need it in the city of New York.



But the bottom line is that it does not necessarily go hand and hand, that if you take money away from one, you put it into the other. That is an old political argument, because as soon as you eliminate one, the money may not be there for the second.

I want to make it clear to all of my colleagues here, I think Westway is a project that can be very beneficial and helpful to the city of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. GARCIA and by unanimous consent, Mr. SOLOMON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman and appreciate my colleague yielding.

Just yesterday on the exit polls that were taken as people were leaving the polling places—and as most of you know, it was primary day in New York—over 70 percent, well over 70 percent, of the New Yorkers from all over the city of New York are in favor of the Westway project. I think it is important that we understand that there are some of us who have disagreements, and because we are from New York does not necessarily mean that we have the same interests.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Before I yield to the other gentleman from New York, you know, I have stood in this well and I have fought for New York City to get funds that were badly needed. New York City is the immigration capital of this country. It has special needs. For us to stand here and fight for this kind of funds, which are not really needed for the city, and then not to be able to get them when we really do need them is a bad thing to be doing.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure that the gentleman, my distinguished friend, Mr. GARCIA, when he stated that New York City people disagree with New York State people on this issue, that he does not forget, that he did not forget that I happen to represent a district, in whose district Westway would lie in its entirety. I live in the city of New York, representing parts of Manhattan and the Bronx. I do not know the poll that the gentleman cited, but I know that up to that poll every poll and survey taken inside my district and anyplace else in

the city of New York indicated that people are opposed to the project and support trading the program in for mass transit.

Mr. SOLOMON. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] has just made the best argument to vote for this amendment. The project is in his district. Those of you who believe in home rule and do not like to have projects jammed down your throat in your district, support the Coughlin amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter of who is proenvironment or antienvironment. It is not a question of pro-Westway or anti-Westway. Nor is it a matter of who wants to control Federal spending and who does not.

The issue is the creation of good transportation policy and fairness. It is a question of whether this House will support an amendment that is poor transportation policy, is unfair to one State and provides no alternatives to meet the legitimate transportation needs of New York City.

It is also a question of whether we should rush to approve this ill-conceived amendment that has already been rejected by the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee. It was opposed by the chairman of the full committee and subcommittee. The House should not endorse this back door method of legislation on an appropriations bill when the authorizing committee that has sole jurisdiction over this matter is set to consider a well thought out proposal that will prohibit Westway yet deal with this issue fairly in a matter of days.

This is not a vote to determine who is anti-Westway. Nobody could possibly accuse me of being pro-Westway. I have already sponsored legislation that will stop this environmentally unsound misuse of highway trust funds. However, after years of work in the transportation field, I believe that the approach proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is simply unsound.

To begin with, this proposal does not even effectively prohibit Westway. It is a provision that has a life of 1 year. Unless this amendment were approved every year, Westway could be revived. Even if that were done, this amendment could easily be circumvented. It would bar Federal funds for the landfill that is estimated at \$700 million but would not affect the rest of the project. In that case, New York could use its own funds for the landfill and still receive 90-percent Federal funding for the rest of the multibillion-dollar project.

The implications of this amendment should not be disregarded. This would be the first time that Congress would be telling a State that it could not build a legiti-

mately approved segment of the Interstate Highway System. I do not believe that the Members of this body would want to take a step like that with this hastily prepared amendment on the wrong bill. If this type of action can be taken against New York, it could be taken against any other State.

It's also not fair to tell New York it cannot build this project and must come up with a complete new transportation plan within 2 weeks. That's what this amendment would do. It tells New York that if it does not develop a new transportation plan, in detail, by September 30, it will not get any of the funds it is entitled to for its Midtown Manhattan transportation problems. The proponents of this amendment say New York should trade in the Westway project for \$1.7 billion in mass transit funds. Under this amendment, that could not be done. New York would not get its highway money and it would also not get its mass transit funds.

I don't believe that the Members of the House want to vote for that kind of proposal.

We should also consider the haste with which this step is being taken. The sponsor of this amendment came to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation earlier this year as the committee with jurisdiction over this issue and asked us to take action to stop Westway. We are doing that. We have legislation to be marked up in 2 weeks that will stop Westway. Let me make it clear. Whether or not this amendment is passed, we will not allow Westway to be built. But our proposal, drafted in the proper forum, is fair to New York and allows the development of good transportation policy. This amendment is unfair and poor policy.

I know that it is easy to vote for this amendment. If it is passed, only New York City is hurt—it does not affect the rest of the country. But we must look beyond that simplistic approach and consider what is right. There is a question of good policy and fairness. There is a right way to legislate. This amendment is not the right way to legislate. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and allow the Committee on Public Works and Transportation to pursue its legitimate role as the authorizing committee with jurisdiction. If you are truly concerned about transportation and about stopping Westway, you will vote against this amendment.

I would like to state that I am totally opposed to the Westway project, and I am totally opposed to this amendment. This amendment is not a pro- or anti-Westway amendment. During the debate there have been many arguments in favor of this amendment, talking about the budget deficit, about the fiscal situation, about how people need education, about how people need clothing, about how they need food. The gentleman from Michigan, and my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. GUARINI, made this point against Westway.

The fact is that there is no competition for those kinds of necessary things with Westway. Westway, if it is built, will be built with highway trust fund money which is designated only for the Federal-aid highway program.

Should there be a transfer of funds, in order to get transit money the funding would come from general revenues. Then we would be competing with food, clothing, and housing. This amendment has nothing to do with the budget.

One other point I would like to make: We have had extensive debate this afternoon on whether to vote yes or no on Westway. We have not had any debate on this amendment, and what we are going to be voting on is this amendment. The reason that we should reject this amendment is that it is so faulty.

What it says is that none of the funds in this bill may be used for the approval of, or to pay the salary of any person who approves projects to construct a landfill in the Hudson River as part of an interstate system.

It merely says that you cannot have anyone approve the landfill money.

Does that mean that this will eliminate Westway? No. Westway is a project of a tunnel offshore that will require 10 percent, or 230 acres, of the Hudson River will be filled in.

The plan for Westway is that about 130 acres will be used for parks and recreation. The other 100 would be used for real estate and commercial development. This is what we oppose in Westway.

However, if this amendment passes, you could still get Westway. There could still be the Federal money to build all of Westway with the exception of the cost of the landfill.

So if New York City decides that they will put their own money in for the landfill, the entire project can be built. Then New York could sell off the entire 230 acres of riverfront property for real estate development and none of that profit would go back to the highway trust fund or to the Federal Government. So it could still be built.

Another problem is this: Should New York say, "All right, we will not build the offshore interstate, we will build an interstate on land so we do not have a landfill," they would not be permitted to do that under this amendment. The only interstate that is permitted is the one under the design that was approved under the Federal-aid Highway Amendments of 1981.

This amendment does not set that aside. New York would be blocked from building an interstate on land.

Then people say, "Well, maybe they trade it in for other streets, and roads, and mass transit." The deadline for approval of interstate transfer is September 30. That is only 19 days away.

Let us say it takes 2 weeks to get this bill through the other body, and to the President's desk, and to become law. That gives them 4 days for an interstate transfer. That interstate transfer must be in an application to the Federal Government, not just saying we want to transfer the funds, but it has to spell out how they are going to use that money for the streets and transit. They would not be able to do that in 4 days. New York then would be left without any chance for transit money or any other money.

What would New York do then? They cannot build the interstate under this amendment unless they are willing to pay for the landfill and they cannot get any transit money. This bill, inappropriate as it is, is only a 1-year bill. It only freezes this situation for 1 year. New York City would have no alternative but to sit back and wait for 1 year until this bill dies and then come back fighting for Westway again. It is a 1-year wait and delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOWARD was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOWARD. There is legislation introduced in this year's highway transit bill that will deny Westway. It will do it in an orderly way, a proper and a fair way. It is not a "get-New York" amendment. But it will not allow Westway to be built. It prohibits the entire project. New York will not be able to build the landfill whether they use their own money or the Federal Government's money.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think my friend and colleague and very distinguished chairman and I are trying to accomplish the same thing. That is what disturbs me. I know that the gentleman has indicated that the highway trust fund was intended to be used for highway construction repair, not for this kind of a landfill project. Your own legislation prohibits the use of funds from the highway trust fund for the Westway project and permits the development of an interstate highway built on existing land.

I guess all we are trying to do here is to allow your committee the time to act, to prevent having an initiation of this landfill project until the gentleman's committee has had the opportunity to act. Whatever the gentleman does would supersede anything that is done here today. It is awfully important, it seems to me, to accomplish what the gentleman and I want to accomplish. We should not go precipitously into this big landfill project.

Mr. HOWARD. Well, what the amendment does, though, is leave open the possibility that Westway could be built. At the same time, the amendment precludes the situation where New York might want to build an interstate on land with no landfill at all.

It still leaves the opening for not 80 or 90 acres but 230 acres of landfill to be used for profit on real estate.

So what I think we should do, whether we are pro- or anti-Westway—and I am anti-Westway—is do what is sensible, what is orderly, what is fair. Let us defeat this amendment, and let us stop Westway in the proper way in this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I just heard the gentleman, my good friend, I might say, from New Jersey, Mr. HOWARD, saying that he is opposed to the project, but yet he is opposed to the amendment. I feel almost as confused as the young boy who dropped his gum in a chicken coop. The gentleman has had plenty of time to work on this issue through the years. I stopped this project from proceeding 2 years ago in the full Appropriations Committee. I am just wondering what the gentleman and his committee have been doing to resolve this issue during that period of time.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I would be glad to yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What we have been doing is monitoring this project. Just recently it became apparent that a great deal of this acreage was going to be used for real estate development. That is when we took our position in opposition. We have not been fooling around over there in the committee by not addressing this issue.

Mr. CONTE. Well, it would have been nice if the public works committee had moved promptly and killed this project. We gave you a 2-year leeway when I stopped this project in full committee 2 years ago.

I know your committee has a lot of work to do; you people have a big agenda.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

My concern about this project focuses especially on the striped bass, or the rockfish as they call it in Maryland, habitat in the Hudson River that



will be completely destroyed by this proposed landfill.

On two occasions now, the Federal courts have stopped construction of the Westway project for failing to take into account of the habitat of the striped bass.

I know you are all familiar with the Federal legislation on striped bass adopted last year, requiring interstate efforts to restore the rockfish, or the striped bass, population. Just last month the State of Virginia imposed a permanent ban on the catching of rockfish, and other States are following suit.

We are spending millions of dollars to clean up the Chesapeake Bay habitat, which along with the Hudson River accounts for over 90 percent of the rockfish along the Atlantic Coast. How silly we would look today to spend millions of dollars to save the rockfish while we permit New York State to waste over \$1 billion in Federal money for a landfill that would destroy the habitat of the rockfish along the Hudson River.

As my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. COUGHLIN, has pointed out, the Federal court in New York has enjoined further work on this project. Why, then, should we pass this amendment? The reason is that New York has to make a choice in the next several weeks over whether to continue to pursue this project, or to trade in this project for a badly needed transit funding. It is important that New York, and the Federal Highway Administration, understand that congressional intent does not permit the construction of landfills such as this, which are primarily for real estate development instead of transportation, with Federal highway money.

That point has been made clear by Chairman HOWARD in the Committee on Public Works, who introduced legislation of his own clarifying the issue of the legislative intent. But because of the time constraints, and because this bill is moving ahead of the new highway authorization, this restriction should be adopted today.

I know that many of the Members have heard from our former colleague and now mayor of New York, Ed Koch. I would like to close by reading remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, 1977, by the then-Member, Ed Koch.

On that day, Ed Koch inserted an extension entitled: "The Approval of Westway is an Environmental and Financial Fiasco That the Carter Administration Should Try To Correct."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CONTE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CONTE. I quote:

Mr. Koch. Mr. Speaker, today Secretary of Transportation William T. Coleman announced his approval of the interstate highway segment proposed to be built on the

West Side of New York in landfill in the Hudson River. This project is estimated to cost \$1.2 billion at the present time, but will only provide 4.2 miles of roadway from the Battery in Lower Manhattan to 42d Street in New York City. Along with a number of my colleagues from New York City I signed a statement today that summarizes our views on the situation. Briefly we believe that the authority which exists in the Highway Act to substitute mass transit projects for this interstate segment should be employed. Even if the predominate share of the \$1.2 billion were to be spent for mass transit improvements, there would still be money available for providing a suitable and small highway on New York's West Side.\*\*\*

Ed Koch opposed this project in 1977. Ed Koch was right, in 1977. The project has not changed at all. It is still an environmental and financial fiasco.

Ed, I hope you are watching this on C-SPAN. Shame on you, Ed Koch. Shame on you. Shame on you for trying to destroy our striped bass. Shame on you for trying to bail out these developers in New York, these greedy developers, who will fill in and destroy the habitat of all the striped bass and the rockfish.

Vote for the Coughlin amendment and return some sanity to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 287, noes 132, not voting 15, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 297]

##### AYES—287

Andrews	Campbell	Durbin
Annuzio	Carper	Dwyer
Anthony	Chandler	Dyson
Applegate	Chapman	Eckart (OH)
Archer	Chapple	Edgar
Armey	Cheney	Edwards (OK)
AuCoin	Clay	Emerson
Badham	Coats	English
Barnard	Cobey	Erdreich
Barnes	Coble	Evans (IA)
Bartlett	Coleman (MO)	Evans (IL)
Barton	Coleman (TX)	Fascell
Bates	Combust	Fawell
Bedell	Conte	Feighan
Bellenson	Conyers	Fiedler
Bennett	Cooper	Flelds
Bereuter	Coughlin	Fish
Bilirakis	Craig	Ford (TN)
Boner (TN)	Crockett	Fowler
Bonior (MI)	Daniel	Frank
Bonker	Dannemeyer	Franklin
Boucher	Darden	Frenzel
Boulter	Daub	Frost
Boxer	Davis	Fuqua
Broomfield	de la Garza	Gallo
Brown (CA)	Dellums	Gaydos
Brown (CO)	Derrick	Gekas
Broyhill	DeWine	Gephardt
Bruce	Dicks	Gibbons
Bryant	Dingell	Gingrich
Burton (IN)	Dorgan (ND)	Glickman
Byron	Dowdy	Gonzalez
Callahan	Dreier	Goodling

Gordon	McCandless	Schulze
Gradison	McCollum	Seiberling
Gray (PA)	McCurdy	Sensenbrenner
Gregg	McDade	Sharp
Guarini	McEwen	Shelby
Hall (OH)	McKernan	Shumway
Hall, Ralph	McMillan	Sikorski
Hamilton	Meyers	Siljander
Hansen	Mica	Skeen
Hartnett	Miller (CA)	Skelton
Hatcher	Miller (WA)	Slattery
Heftel	Mitchell	Slaughter
Hendon	Montgomery	Smith (FL)
Henry	Moore	Smith (NE)
Hertel	Moorhead	Smith (NH)
Hiler	Morrison (CT)	Smith (NJ)
Hillis	Morrison (WA)	Smith, Denny
Holt	Murphy	Smith, Robert
Hopkins	Neal	Snowe
Hubbard	Nelson	Solarz
Huckaby	Nichols	Solomon
Hughes	Nielson	Spence
Hutto	O'Brien	Spratt
Hyde	Oakar	St Germain
Ireland	Oberstar	Staggers
Jacobs	Obey	Stallings
Jenkins	Olin	Stark
Johnson	Ortiz	Stenholm
Jones (OK)	Oxley	Studds
Kanjorski	Packard	Stump
Kaptur	Panetta	Sundquist
Kasich	Parris	Sweeney
Kennelly	Pashayan	Swindall
Kildee	Pease	Synar
Kindness	Penny	Tallon
Kolbe	Pepper	Tauke
Kostmayer	Petri	Tauzin
Kramer	Porter	Thomas (CA)
Lagomarsino	Price	Thomas (GA)
Lantos	Rangel	Torricelli
Leach (IA)	Ray	Valentine
Leath (TX)	Regula	Vander Jagt
Lehman (CA)	Reid	Vento
Leland	Richardson	Visclosky
Levine (CA)	Ridge	Volkmer
Lewis (FL)	Rinaldo	Vucanovich
Lightfoot	Ritter	Walgren
Livingston	Roberts	Walker
Lloyd	Robinson	Waxman
Loeffler	Rodino	Weaver
Lott	Roemer	Weber
Lowery (CA)	Rogers	Weiss
Lowry (WA)	Rostenkowski	Whittaker
Lujan	Roth	Wirth
Lungren	Roukema	Wolpe
Mack	Rowland (CT)	Wortley
MacKay	Rudd	Wyden
Madigan	Russo	Wyllie
Markey	Saxton	Yates
Marlenee	Schaefer	Yatron
Matsui	Schneider	Young (FL)
Mazzoli	Schroeder	Zschau
McCain	Schuetz	

##### NOES—132

Dixon	Kiecicka
Donnelly	Kolter
Dornan (CA)	LaFalce
Downey	Latta
Duncan	Lehman (FL)
Early	Lent
Eckert (NY)	Levin (MI)
Edwards (CA)	Lewis (CA)
Fazio	Lipinski
Flippo	Luken
Florio	Lundine
Foglietta	Manton
Foley	Martin (IL)
Ford (MI)	Martin (NY)
Garcia	Martinez
Gejdenson	Mavroules
Gilman	McCloskey
Gray (IL)	McGrath
Green	McHugh
Gunderson	McKinney
Hammerschmidt	Michel
Hawkins	Mikulski
Hayes	Mineta
Hefner	Moakley
Horton	Mollinari
Howard	Mollohan
Hoyer	Monson
Jones (NC)	Moody
Jones (TN)	Mrazek
Kemp	Myers

Natcher	Schumer	Traxler
Nowak	Shaw	Udall
Owens	Shuster	Watkins
Perkins	Slitsky	Wheat
Pickle	Smith (IA)	Whitehurst
Quillen	Snyder	Whitley
Rahall	Stangeland	Whitten
Roe	Stokes	Williams
Rose	Stratton	Wilson
Rowland (GA)	Swift	Wise
Roybal	Taylor	Wolf
Sabo	Torres	Wright
Savage	Towns	Young (AK)
Scheuer	Trafficant	Young (MO)

## NOT VOTING—15

Addabbo	Dymally	Long
Akaka	Grotberg	Miller (OH)
Bevill	Hunter	Murtha
Crane	Jeffords	Pursell
Dickinson	Kastenmeier	Strang

## □ 1540

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Grotberg for, with Mrs. Long against. Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mrs. BENTLEY changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. PARRIS changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## □ 1555

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHARDSON

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDSON: On Page 26, line 5, strike the period and add the following: "Provided further, notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, the amount available is reduced by \$22,100,000."

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simply to conform to the House-Senate passed budget resolution by enacting what they decided and which we voted on prior to adjournment. A 1-year, 15-percent reduction for Amtrak. In effect, however, what this amendment basically does is it reduces the appropriation for Amtrak from \$603.5 million, which the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation offered recently in an amendment that was a 5-percent cut, and inserts in lieu thereof a total of \$581.4 million.

This is not an anti-Amtrak amendment. I am not sitting here being critical of Amtrak. I am a strong supporter of Amtrak. Once again, this is not an anti-Amtrak amendment. I am the author of the authorization bill in the Energy and Commerce Committee for Amtrak. I am a strong supporter of it, but I think it is important that we be fiscally responsible and we simply follow what the House-Senate budget compromise has enacted.

In effect, what my amendment would do is it would simply reduce by approximately 1 percent what my colleague and chairman of the subcom-

mittee, Representative LEHMAN, has done in his amendment. Once again, I believe that these cuts can be sustained. They will not affect existing service. I do think there are plenty of provisions in the authorization bill that ensure the viability of Amtrak. I think it has performed well; ridership is up.

On the other hand, I think if the message from our constituents in August was to reduce the deficit, let us give the budget committees, which have proposed this guideline, that option of sticking very closely to them.

Once again, this is a painful amendment to somebody like myself. I have five Amtrak stops in my district. My district is entirely serviced by Amtrak, but I do think after discussions with Amtrak, that this cut can be easily sustained. It is a bipartisan effort that hopefully my colleague from Indiana, Mr. COATS, will support, and I respectfully ask the House to support this amendment.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LENT. The gentleman from New Mexico made reference to the amendment adopted earlier by the committee that was offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN]. It was my understanding, and please correct me if I am wrong, that the Lehman amendment achieved the 15-percent level of savings for all transportation functions called for in the House budget resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not believe that it did. The Lehman amendment did not achieve that 15 percent. I will yield to my colleague to give you the correct answer. The 15 percent with the Lehman figure is not adhered to. The 15 percent is the 581 that I am proposing.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. The gentleman is correct. But let me point out that that 15 percent, as assumed in the budget resolution, is only advisory, and it is up to the Appropriations Committee to come up with the specific reductions to meet the overall spending target set in this resolution. We have done so. We are within our 302(b) allocation, and I will speak on this at greater length later on.

Mr. COATS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

(On request of Mr. COATS and by unanimous consent, Mr. RICHARDSON was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. COATS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. The gen-

tleman and I had worked in the Committee on Energy and Commerce to try to come up with a reasonable reduction in the funding for Amtrak that would preserve a national rail transportation system, but yet allow Amtrak to attain some cost savings and operate in a more efficient way.

There was some debate about whether that reduction should be 10 percent or 15 percent. The Senate was looking at approximately a 30-percent reduction. Ultimately the question was resolved that we would look to the Budget Committee and the final budget resolution as to the level for reduction. That budget resolution that most of us voted for here on the floor, on a bipartisan basis, came in with a 15-percent reduction in Amtrak's Federal subsidies. We declared a victory on the budget; we went home and told our constituents that we have enacted meaningful budget deficit reductions. That these reductions were going to stick; that these were real reductions; and that these reductions really meant something. That interest rates could now come down.

Now we are back here faced with the first real test of whether we meant what we said. Whether we are willing to enforce that budget resolution. This is a very basic amendment. The Appropriations Committee amended the reduction in Amtrak from the original 10 percent to approximately 11.5 percent. This amendment simply moves the reduction to 15 percent. A small, 3.5-percent increment to bring it in line with what the House majority agreed to do just before we left for the August recess.

I think the gentleman's amendment has a great deal of merit, and it has a symbolic importance, far more important than just this issue. That issue, the real issue that we are dealing with is whether or not we are willing to abide by what we said last August, we were going to do.

So in order to meet those budget goals, in order to demonstrate our political will to the people back home, I think we ought to adopt this amendment. Now, we wish we had the opportunity to make this change in the authorization bill first, before we dealt with the appropriation. Unfortunately, for whatever reason, the appropriations bill was brought up before the authorization bill. Therefore, this is our opportunity to bring the appropriations bill in line with what we agreed to do.

There are numerous ways that Amtrak can achieve these additional 3.5-percent savings without discontinuing railines, without interrupting any service. We worked and listed a number of ways in the Commerce, Transportation, Tourism Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, however we thought it better



to leave the discretion to Amtrak as to how they could achieve these savings. Graham Claytor, president of Amtrak, runs a great little railroad. He has made some significant strides, and we think he can find this additional 3.5 percent. If he cannot, we have a number of suggestions that we can give him. Our committee has pledged to work with him in finding these savings.

I think it is important for Members on both sides of the aisle to stick to our agreement; do what we agreed to do in August, and show those people back home that when the first test is up before us, we are willing to stand up and do what we agreed to do.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to commend the gentleman for his bipartisan effort in support of this amendment. Once again, we are pro-Amtrak. This is simply to statistically conform to the House-Senate budget agreement. If we are going to stick to this agreement, which is important, which was adopted right before we adjourned, I think this is a minimal effort. A \$22 million reduction out of hundreds of millions of dollars will not affect operations, and I think it is important that in this first vote of the session that we conform with that figure.

□ 1605

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Earlier this afternoon this committee passed a \$1 billion reduction in a variety of accounts. That meets the spirit and the intent of what this House voted on before it adjourned in August. Included among the accounts that we voted on was a \$12.5 million reduction in Amtrak.

Last year Amtrak was at \$684 million. We brought the bill to the floor of the House at \$616 million. On the floor of the House today we reduced it to \$603.5 million. That to me is what I call fiscal responsibility on Amtrak.

I do not want to be a friend of Amtrak and cut it down to the bone to where it cannot operate. I want Amtrak to survive. It has already taken its fair share of cuts. There is already an 11.8-percent reduction in Amtrak. I do not think it is responsible to make any further reductions if we really want to keep a viable national passenger railroad.

If additional savings are required, the only responsible way to achieve them, as my friend, the gentleman from New Mexico, knows is through changes in authorizing legislation concerning collective bargaining, the cost-sharing with the freight railroads, and the like. I would hope in his authorizing committee that he will pursue these kinds of savings.

Let me repeat what I said before: That the amounts assumed in the

budget resolution are only assumptions. They are only advisory. They are not across-the-board cuts. They are not specified. It is up to the Committee on Appropriations to come up with the specific reductions to meet the overall spending targets set in the budget resolution. The budget resolution sent a 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations. We have our 302(b) allocation from that 302(a) allocation from the Committee on Appropriations. We are within this allocation.

I would urge the defeat of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico and preserve a viable Amtrak passenger operation that is now beginning to serve this country as it should be.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in strong support of the position of the subcommittee chairman. First of all, I back his comments about the validity of the figure that he currently has in the bill as it relates to Amtrak. I think it is the proper one.

But there is another very important point here, and that is that the Committee on the Budget has made an overall figure clear for transit spending, but it does not have the responsibility, and I say this as a member of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, to determine specific levels as it relates to various kinds of transportation funding. That is the jurisdiction of this committee and the subcommittee, particularly in light of the amendment that was offered and agreed to at the very beginning, offered by the chairman. It has met its responsibilities to the Committee on the Budget. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] and his subcommittee have done what we have asked them to do in the budget process.

We do not need to now, in a more detailed way, restrict their ability to make priorities among the various transportation accounts, so I would urge the committee to stand with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] and against the amendment. We have met our budget resolution figure. We do not need to cut Amtrak further here to accomplish that overall goal.

I appreciate the position the gentleman has taken.

Mr. COATS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman indicated that the Appropriations Sub-

committee met its overall goal of the budget process, yet Amtrak was not brought to the level that the Committee on the Budget suggested.

Could the gentleman tell me where the cuts were made and in what other programs they were made in order to reach that overall goal?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. We made cuts in a number of areas. We made cuts in the FAA. We made cuts in the Urban Mass Transportation Administration and in other areas.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment to make a further cut in the appropriations for Amtrak. Under the amendment of the gentleman from Florida, which was already adopted, Amtrak has already been cut another \$12.5 million to a level of \$603.5 million, an amount which is 11.4 percent below last year's level of \$684 million. I might add that I supported that reduction very reluctantly, and did so only because it was a part of an overall, billion dollar reduction to bring this bill in line with our need to reduce the Federal deficit.

In my view, any further reduction in Amtrak spending would be extremely unwise. In a letter to me dated September 3, 1985, Graham Claytor, the president of Amtrak, indicated that even with full funding at the freeze level of \$684 million, Amtrak would have to absorb an estimated \$63 million in inflation over its 1985 costs. He indicated that a 10-percent cut would require substantial reductions in Amtrak's 1986 capital program, and holding wages and salaries at the 1985 level despite the fact that they are already 12 percent below average rail industry rates.

In addition, further changes would have to include the deferment of equipment overhauls and some non-safety-related Northeast corridor right-of-way improvements.

He indicated that any further reductions of the kind contemplated by this amendment, would require significant cutbacks in service frequencies.

Mr. Chairman, this would be exactly the wrong time to make this kind of a drastic reduction in Amtrak funding. All indications are that service is improving, and Amtrak is consistently relying on the Federal Government for less and less of its budget. Unlike most other transportation programs, Amtrak is an ongoing business in a very competitive service industry. Further reducing Amtrak funding, and forcing service cuts, is exactly the way to prevent Amtrak from continuing its effort to gradually reduce its need for Federal appropriations.

Perhaps the strongest recommendation for Amtrak, other than the hun-

dreds of letters from Amtrak riders who support the continuation of Amtrak service, lies in the fact that the Department of Transportation's original budget submitted to OMB called for \$765 million—\$81 million more than last year.

Although Amtrak was knocked out of the budget by my friend, the now-missed young slasher, Dave Stockman, it is clear from the original departmental submission that the transportation experts want to see Amtrak funded at the highest possible level.

Mr. Chairman, Amtrak has made dramatic improvements during the past 14 years in its on-time performance, its operating efficiency, and its revenue-to-cost ratio. Amtrak's level of subsidy has steadily decreased, and it has met or exceeded the revenue-to-cost requirements that the Congress has set.

It would be a transportation policy disaster, and a grave fiscal error, to cut Amtrak off just as it seems to be coming into its own.

Finally, let me address the question of the budget resolution. Earlier today, we adopted an amendment to bring this bill in line with our overall need to reduce the Federal deficit. We cut \$1 billion from this bill. Let me say that the Budget Committee's recommendations are just that—recommendations. Under the Budget Act, it is the Appropriations Committee's responsibility to evaluate the competing needs for transportation funding. We have held numerous hearings, and have recommended the level in this bill.

Our obligation under the Budget Act is for the Appropriations Committee to spend no more than the permissible amount for the total of all appropriations bills. We have made overall recommendations to comply with that obligation, and this particular amendment is not required in order to meet our responsibilities to reduce the Federal deficit.

Mr. Chairman, if an authorization bill should be enacted that reduces Amtrak spending, of course that would control. But in the absence of such an enactment, I urge that the recommendations of the committee be followed, and that Amtrak be permitted to stay on track.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

AMTRAK,  
NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER  
CORPORATION,

Washington, DC., September 3, 1985.

Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE,  
House of Representatives, Rayburn Office  
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONTE: Thank you for your letter of August 9 regarding the impact a 15 percent funding reduction would have on Amtrak's ability to operate the current route system.

In testimony before Congress this year, I urged support for a funding freeze of \$684 million to operate our national railroad pas-

senger system in fiscal year 1986. Even with full funding at the freeze level Amtrak would have to absorb an estimated \$63 million in inflation over our FY1985 costs. Amtrak considered this a bare bones budget which would have required continued significant improvements in productivity over our current performance.

In response to questioning, however, I stated that it may be possible for Amtrak to continue to operate essentially the same routes it operates today if we receive funding at a level 10 percent below the fiscal year 1985 baseline. I had hoped that we would get by with this funding level and that we would be able, through our internally achieved efficiencies, to generate an acceptable maintenance posture and capital program in the out years. Among the actions Amtrak indicated it would take to operate with a 10 percent funding cut include:

Substantial reduction in the scope of Amtrak's capital program in FY86.

Hold employee wages and salaries at or near FY85 levels, in spite of the fact that wages are already 12 percent below rail industry rates, and middle and upper management salaries have a significantly greater differential.

Possible reduction of on-board service crew sizes and station manning levels, with some resulting adverse impact on quality of service and revenues.

Defer equipment overhauls and some right-of-way maintenance in the Northeast Corridor to the extent possible without impacting safety.

Limited reductions and the rearrangement of frequencies in the Northeast Corridor and on some long-distance routes, limited so as not to trigger labor protection obligations.

As you indicate, the FY86 First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget recommends a 15 percent funding cut for Amtrak, which is \$34 million below the subcommittee mark, and a total of \$100 million below Amtrak's FY1985 funding level. If Amtrak funding is reduced by \$34 million in addition to the 10 percent reduction already contemplated, it will probably require elimination of frequencies in the Northeast and the restructuring of more additional long-distance routes from daily to tri-weekly service. Unlike most of the other programs and agencies that the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee funds, Amtrak is an ongoing business in a very competitive industry. It is unrealistic to believe that a \$100 million reduction in our funding from one year to the next will not have significant effects on both the level and quality of service we provide. In sum, Amtrak will survive with a 10 percent budget reduction and can accomplish many of these savings by taking actions that are based on sound business practices, but the company's long-term economic health and long-term program to continue to improve our service while requiring less and less federal operating support would be jeopardized by Appropriations Committee actions that imposed more drastic funding reductions in any one year.

With respect to your comments on the Montrealer, Amtrak is considering a series of changes which include establishing a stop in Greenfield, Massachusetts and shifting the operation of the train to a daylight schedule. I have asked my staff to review the feasibility of instituting an additional stop at Holyoke, Massachusetts and will advise you of our findings as soon as the analysis is complete.

Your support for Amtrak is appreciated more than I can tell you. I hope I have adequately answered your questions. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

W. GRAHAM CLAYTON, Jr.,  
President.

□ 1615

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CONTE was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, let me direct my attention to the gentleman from New Mexico and the gentleman from Indiana. If you are going to go by every assumption of the Budget Committee resolution and not the bottom line that they give us, you might as well make an amendment to this amendment and repeal the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct an inquiry to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], the manager of the bill.

I observe on page 83 of the committee report the following language:

The amount recommended for research and technical assistance includes \$5,000,000 for continuation of the cold weather transit technology program \* \* \*.

I think that is an important program, with very positive prospects of saving lives. It is my understanding that the bill included such directions, last year, but that the money never was spent. Is that fundamentally correct?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is true. The distinguished majority leader is absolutely right.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the distinction I discern is that this year you have attributed a specific sum; namely, \$5 million, earmarked expressly for that research and technical assistance program; is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WRIGHT. And I discern therefrom that under the rules and the law the administration is expected to spend it?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. That is right, unless they defer it or rescind it, and that would take action that I do not think would be forthcoming.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we hear a lot of talk from time to time about how the defi-



cits that this country is faced with are, in fact, Presidential deficits, and that this Congress has been responsible in what it has done and, in fact, deficits cannot be blamed upon us.

Here is one of these amendments that gives us some clear way of defining what is real in this business of defining deficits, and I would hope that we would vote in that way.

The President had suggested in this bill a budget for transportation that was \$3.3 billion under what the subcommittee reported and \$2.3 billion under the measure as now amended by the subcommittee on the floor. Six hundred million dollars of that \$2.3 billion is in the Amtrak account.

The President has suggested that what we should do on Amtrak is eliminate the Government subsidy completely, and he suggests that we have had 14 years of Amtrak attempting to get on its feet with taxpayer money, so what we now have is not a case of a viable system being created; what we have is a process, as the chairman of the subcommittee honestly admitted, of trying to maintain a viable system.

Now, the question becomes this: How long are we going to do that, and what do we regard as "viable"? Because as the OMB has made clear on a couple of occasions, we now have lines on Amtrak where it would be cheaper for us to fly people first class aboard airlines than to have them take the train. The Government would be better off, and the taxpayers would be better off flying people first class than having them on those railines with the kind of subsidy money we are spending.

That is ridiculous. The taxpayers in times of deficits should not be asked to do that kind of thing, and, in fact, the President is correct, that this is one of those programs we ought to look at for total elimination, saving \$600 million and thereby doing something about the deficit.

But, of course, this Congress does not like to look at the elimination of any program. So what we end up doing is trying to act incrementally about spending, and at least with this amendment what we are doing is trying to incrementally reduce the program a little bit—a program that ought to be eliminated, and a case can be made for eliminating it completely. At least we ought to cut back a little bit.

What is the gentleman from New Mexico proposing? He is proposing a \$22.1 million cut in that \$600 million account. That hardly seems to be to be something that is going to wreck the total viability of the system, and it hardly seems to me to be anything which is going to get the Government completely out of the Amtrak business. It is just an attempt to do a little something toward addressing the deficit and come a little closer to what the

budget resolution says we ought to be doing.

I recognize that the Appropriations Committee does not like us bringing up points where the budget resolution and the appropriations process are in conflict, but the fact is that the budget process is constantly being undermined on the House floor with this whole process of figuring things a different way. The problem with that is that every time we figure things a different way we end up raising spending, and over the last 5 years we have overspent our own budgets by \$150 billion.

Now, that did not just emerge out of thin air. That came about as a result of us deciding consciously to spend more money in appropriation bills than what we had budgeted. That came about as a result of supplemental appropriations, it came about as add-ons to continuing appropriations, and it comes about for a variety of reasons. But the fact is we are overspending our own budgets around here constantly. This is one more case where we can cast one small vote to try to bring the appropriations more in line with the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that here is a program we should be talking about eliminating completely. At the very least we ought to be talking about cutting it back a little bit. I support the amendment.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to rise in opposition to my good friends and colleagues, the gentlemen from Pennsylvania and New Mexico, but I would point out that we have cut the funding for Amtrak, not once but twice. We cut the funding for Amtrak in subcommittee, and we cut the funding for Amtrak again in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], chairman of the subcommittee, which was adopted on the floor of the House only a few hours ago.

We are at the budget level for the transportation function as a result of the amendment introduced by the subcommittee chairman. The appropriations Committee has made its own cuts as is its right to determine where the cuts should be made.

In the Transportation Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee we spent untold hours trying to review all the transportation programs and decide which priorities should be which. We have looked at this, we have looked at what the Budget Committee wanted, and we have looked at the bottom line. We have met the bottom line. We have a bill that meets the Budget Committee's recommendation; it is much less than last year, much below the freeze level.

Mr. Chairman, let me further point out that Amtrak has a peculiar problem in adjusting service levels about which many people are unaware. My good colleague and friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, referred to some lines that may not pay their own way. One of the problems Amtrak has is that the discontinuing of a line that even Amtrak might want to discontinue triggers what are called labor protection payments. That means that we have got to pay the people affected the equivalent of 6 years' wages as a result of the discontinuance of a particular line. In many cases the discontinuance of lines would cost more than they would save because of lack of control of those labor protection payments and lack of action by this Congress, if you will, to eliminate the triggering of those payments as lines are changed.

So I think what has been done here by the Appropriations Committee and by the Transportation Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is entirely in order. We are at the budget level. We have reduced Amtrak. If we are forced to reduce it more, it is not going to be able to function. Amtrak is important, not just to provide passenger service for this country, as is provided in every other nation, but also for national defense.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUGHLIN. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his statement and join him and the chairman of the subcommittee, along with the ranking minority member of the full committee, in opposition to this amendment.

It is clear that we have substantially reduced the spending in this bill. It is clear that we have also substantially reduced Amtrak funding from last year. I think it is also clear that Amtrak has been doing a better job year by year in managing its system and maintaining a viable rail passenger service in this country. To cut deeper, I think, would do violence to that system, and I hope that this body will reject the proposed amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the language in the report on page 6 with regard to protecting the health and safety of airline passengers, and I would like to commend the committee for that language.

I think this is a very serious matter. I would point out that it is possible to have legislation on this. I think it would pass overwhelmingly in this

body. Legislation would require what the report language expects the Department to do same thing, but it is preferable for the Department to take action as the report expects. The committee has called to the attention of the Department the problems in airports, and if they take it seriously, they can do it. If they do not, I think there is no alternative in the future than to have some kind of a legislative solution.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for its action in this matter.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment which seeks further cuts in the Federal subsidy for Amtrak.

Reductions already proposed in this legislation are adequate inasmuch as a funding level of \$603 million would afford Amtrak adequate opportunity to make the transition from a subsidized to a nonsubsidized entity over a period of time. An additional cut of 5 percent, as proposed by the gentleman from New Mexico, would mean a certain and premature death to the Nation's passenger railroad system.

I am informed and convinced that any further cuts in funding for fiscal 1986 would necessitate the deferral of maintenance, equipment overhauls, and roadbed repairs for the system. Such a deferral, in the opinion of numerous rail experts, would cause the entity to fall into a desperate state of disrepair—probably to the point of no return.

Amtrak has done a commendable job thus far in cutting costs both in the areas of labor and general operations. In fact, negotiations are currently underway between Amtrak and labor unions to further reduce labor costs. Industry estimates claim that, given adequate time, these costs could be reduced by an additional \$100 to \$150 million. In light of the substantial Federal investment in Amtrak already, it would be, in my judgment, unwise for the Congress to rush into a plan which would have the effect of killing Amtrak merely for short-term gain.

□ 1630

I would hope that my colleagues would agree that this amendment would not be in the Nation's best interest and that the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARRIS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman and join in the sentiments that he expressed in opposition to this particular amendment.

I believe the gentleman from Virginia represents the area in which the

National Airport is situated, is that correct?

Mr. PARRIS. My district borders that facility.

Mr. LENT. I just want to point out to the gentleman one other fact, that 12,000 passengers travel on the airlines between New York and Washington every day and 17,500 travel on the Amtrak between the same two cities. If the Amtrak were to be zeroed out as a result of this, I believe, unwise and injudicious cut a much greater burden would be placed on La Guardia Airport, Newark Airport, and National Airport. Given the number of landings and takeoffs at National Airport, I do not think that airport could reasonably handle the additional burden. I just wanted to throw that in as sort of a makeway argument on why we need to keep Amtrak in business, at least in the Northeast corridor.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution and for his comments.

Let me just add one other thought. In response to the observations of my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], I take, as a Member of this body, a back seat to nobody in terms of his voting record in support of fiscal responsibility; but I do not think you can approach this or any other issue that comes before us in the exercise of these sometimes awesome responsibilities solely from a fiscal point of view. Money is important. Taxes are too high. We would like to reduce Government costs, but that is not the only consideration. The quality of life of the passenger railroad system of this Nation is important to this Nation. I think we have to keep that in mind and reject this amendment.

Mr. COATS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, just a quick summary, I want to make sure that the Members understand that even though there was some discussion about zeroing out Amtrak, removing the Government subsidy from Amtrak, the Richardson amendment does not do that. It simply cuts an additional 3½ percent from the appropriation that is currently before us. This amendment brings it in line with what the House agreed to do in the budget resolution, that was passed on a bipartisan basis just before we adjourned for the August recess. We are not talking about eliminating routes. We are not talking about eliminating Amtrak. In fact, we are not even necessarily talking about reducing service.

Amtrak has demonstrated an improvement in its service and in its efficiency. That is why we are able to come forward with a lower subsidy than what was previously asked for.

That is why Mr. Claytor, President of Amtrak, was able to come before our STE committee and testify that he could operate the railroad in an efficient way and provide full service on a national basis with less money than he had asked from Congress in previous years.

As we are staring at horrendous deficits with untold consequences on our economy and on our future, when someone comes forward and says we can run a railroad with less, I think we ought to listen to him and do what we can.

Mr. Claytor did say that he wanted a 10-percent cut—or would accept a 10-percent cut. We think we can go that additional 5 percent and still provide effective, efficient Amtrak service on a national basis.

As I indicated before when the gentleman yielded to me, a number of suggestions were made in the committee as to ways in which cost savings could be achieved that would not jeopardize the service of Amtrak. We continue to stand ready to work with Amtrak in bringing about and implementing those changes.

So to summarize, let me just state to the Members what we are voting on here is a 3½-percent reduction in funding for Amtrak, which brings it in line with a budget resolution that this body passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COATS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, yeas 245, not voting 16, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 298]

#### AYES—173

Andrews	Coleman (TX)	Gingrich
Archer	Combest	Goodling
Armey	Cooper	Gordon
Atkins	Craig	Gradison
Badham	Dannemeyer	Gregg
Bartlett	Darden	Grothman
Barton	Daschle	Gunderson
Bateman	Davis	Hammerschmidt
Bedell	DeLay	Hansen
Bereuter	Derrick	Hartnett
Billrakis	Dickinson	Hatcher
Boucher	Dornan (CA)	Heftel
Boulter	Dreier	Hendon
Breaux	Duncan	Hill
Broomfield	Eckert (NY)	Hopkins
Brown (CO)	Edwards (OK)	Hubbard
Broyhill	English	Huckaby
Burton (IN)	Erdreich	Hutto
Byron	Evans (IA)	Hyde
Callahan	Fawell	Ireland
Campbell	Fiedler	Johnson
Carney	Fields	Jones (OK)
Chandler	Flippo	Jones (TN)
Cheney	Franklin	Kasich
Coats	Frenzel	Kemp
Cobey	Fuqua	Kindness
Coble	Gaydos	Kolbe
Coleman (MO)	Gibbons	Kramer



Lagomarsino	Morrison (WA)	Smith (NE)	Schneider	Stallings	Weaver
Latta	Neal	Smith (NH)	Schulze	Stark	Weiss
Leath (TX)	Nelson	Smith, Denny	Schumer	Stokes	Wheat
Lewis (FL)	Nichols	Snowe	Seiberling	Stratton	Whittaker
Livingston	Nielson	Snyder	Sharp	Studds	Whitten
Lloyd	Oxley	Solomon	Shelby	Swift	Williams
Loeffler	Packard	Spence	Shuster	Tallon	Wilson
Lott	Petri	Stangeland	Sikorski	Thomas (GA)	Wirth
Lowery (CA)	Porter	Stenholm	Sisisky	Torres	Wise
Lujan	Quillen	Stump	Skelton	Torricelli	Wolf
Luken	Ray	Sundquist	Slaughter	Towns	Wolpe
Lungren	Richardson	Sweeney	Smith (FL)	Trafficant	Wortley
Mack	Ritter	Swindall	Smith (IA)	Traxler	Wright
MacKay	Roberts	Synar	Smith (NJ)	Udall	Wyden
Martin (IL)	Robinson	Tauke	Smith, Robert	Vento	Wyllie
Mazzoli	Roemer	Tauzin	Solarz	Volkmer	Yates
McCain	Rogers	Taylor	Spratt	Walgren	Yatron
McCandless	Roukema	Thomas (CA)	St Germain	Watkins	Young (MO)
McCloskey	Rowland (CT)	Valentine	Staggers	Waxman	
McCurdy	Rudd	Vander Jagt			
McEwen	Saxton	Visclosky			
McKernan	Schaefer	Vucanovich	Addabbo	Dymally	Miller (OH)
McMillan	Schroeder	Walker	Akaka	Hunter	Pursell
Meyers	Schuette	Weber	Bevill	Kastenmeier	Roth
Michel	Sensenbrenner	Whitehurst	Bonker	Long	Strang
Miller (WA)	Shaw	Whitley	Chapman	Markey	
Monson	Shumway	Young (AK)	Crane	McCollum	
Montgomery	Siljander	Young (FL)			
Moore	Skeen	Zschau			
Moorhead	Slattery				

## NOT VOTING—16

□ 1645

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Crane for, with Mrs. Long against.

Messrs. ORTIZ, DE LA GARZA, LIGHTFOOT, and BOEHLERT changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. LLOYD changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 298, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I simply wanted to express my appreciation to the subcommittee, its chairman, and particularly to the gentleman from Michigan for including in the report language that goes along with this legislation recognition by this body of the unequal distribution of noise at the Burbank Airport, which is located in my district, and the fact that the committee's report language urges the FAA and the airport authority to put together a program of runway utilization which will correct that inequity of noise. And furthermore, it is my hope that the subcommittee at its next markup for the fiscal year 1987 bill will review and exercise oversight over the actions of the FAA and the authority and meet the objectives set forth in that report language.

Mr. CARR. I want to commend the gentleman from California for bringing this matter to our attention. He

has been a leader in the Congress and to our committee, although he is not a member of our committee, to our committee on this noise compatibility problem in his district. I think the people in his district ought to be very grateful for the leadership he has exercised.

I want to underscore what the gentleman has said and emphasize to the FAA and to the airport authority out there in California that we are very serious about this problem, and that when we hold hearings next year on the FAA budget, we are going to be expecting that there be some positive and significant movement toward a solution to this problem.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

## ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purposes of a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee. It is with reference to a harbor in my area, Morro Bay Harbor, which has a reputation along the central coast as having one of the most dangerous harbor entrances along the coast. Since 1964, some 15 lives have been lost at the harbor, and there have been other major catastrophes that have been averted just barely. Last year, for example, a boat carrying a number of children was turned over at the entrance to the harbor because of the conditions there.

The city is trying to correct this situation by locating a harbor office with a better view of the entrance to the harbor. The Coast Guard has indicated an interest in utilizing that facility so that they can provide more effective navigational services to users of the harbor.

Recognizing those conditions, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman and the subcommittee to provide in the statement of managers direction to the Secretary that she provide funding within available funds to the city of Morro Bay for the construction of this harbor office, and that the Secretary should work with the city in implementing a plan to allow this facility to be utilized by the Coast Guard and other agencies with navigational responsibilities at the harbor.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California for bringing this to our attention today. I want to assure

## NOES—245

Ackerman	Edgar	Lightfoot
Alexander	Edwards (CA)	Lipinski
Anderson	Emerson	Lowry (WA)
Annuzio	Evans (IL)	Lundine
Anthony	Fascell	Madigan
Applegate	Fazio	Manton
Aspin	Feighan	Marlenee
AuCoin	Fish	Martin (NY)
Barnard	Florio	Martinez
Barnes	Foglietta	Matsui
Bates	Foley	Mavroules
Beilenson	Ford (MI)	McDade
Bennett	Ford (TN)	McGrath
Bentley	Fowler	McHugh
Berman	Frank	McKinney
Biaggi	Frost	Mica
Bliley	Gallo	Mikulski
Boehlert	Garcia	Miller (CA)
Boggs	Gejdenson	Mineta
Boland	Gekas	Mitchell
Boner (TN)	Gephardt	Moakley
Bonior (MI)	Gilman	Mollinari
Borski	Glickman	Mollohan
Bosco	Gonzalez	Moody
Boxer	Gray (IL)	Morrison (CT)
Brooks	Gray (PA)	Mrazek
Brown (CA)	Green	Murphy
Bruce	Guarini	Murtha
Bryant	Hall (OH)	Myers
Burton (CA)	Hall, Ralph	Natcher
Bustamante	Hamilton	Nowak
Carper	Hawkins	O'Brien
Carr	Hayes	Oakar
Chappell	Hefner	Oberstar
Chapple	Henry	Obey
Clay	Hertel	Olin
Clinger	Hillis	Ortiz
Coelho	Holt	Owens
Collins	Horton	Panetta
Conte	Howard	Parris
Conyers	Hoyer	Pashayan
Coughlin	Hughes	Pease
Courter	Jacobs	Penny
Coyne	Jeffords	Pepper
Crockett	Jenkins	Perkins
Daniel	Jones (NC)	Pickle
Daub	Kanjorski	Price
de la Garza	Kaptur	Rahall
Dellums	Kennelly	Rangel
DeWine	Kildee	Regula
Dicks	Kliczka	Reid
Dingell	Kolter	Ridge
DioGuardi	Kostmayer	Rinaldo
Dixon	LaFalce	Rodino
Donnelly	Lantos	Roe
Dorgan (ND)	Leach (IA)	Rose
Dowdy	Lehman (CA)	Rostenkowski
Downey	Lehman (FL)	Rowland (GA)
Durbin	Leland	Roybal
Dwyer	Lent	Russo
Dyson	Levin (MI)	Sabo
Early	Levine (CA)	Savage
Eckart (OH)	Lewis (CA)	Scheuer

him that when we reach the conference on this bill with the other body that we will endeavor to put his language in the statement of the managers.

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the chairman and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, as authorized by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, \$2,000,000.

#### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS-18; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), \$22,400,000, of which not to exceed \$300 may be used for official reception and representation expenses.

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$50,430,000, of which \$2,300,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances of "Payments for directed rail service": *Provided*, That joint board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their official duties as such.

#### PAYMENTS FOR DIRECTED RAIL SERVICE

None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for the execution of programs the obligations for which can reasonably be expected to exceed \$1,000,000 for directed rail service authorized under 49 U.S.C. 11125 or any other legislation.

#### PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

##### OPERATING EXPENSES

For operating expenses necessary for the Panama Canal Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); not to exceed \$10,000 for official reception and representation expenses of the Board; operation of guide services; residence for the Administrator; disbursements by the Administrator for employee and community projects; not to exceed \$5,000 for official reception and representation expenses of the Secretary; not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses of the Administrator; and to employ services as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 3109); \$401,284,000, to be derived from the Panama Canal Commission Fund: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from the Panama Canal Commission's capital outlay account for expenses incurred for supplies and services provided for capital projects.

#### CAPITAL OUTLAY

For acquisition, construction, replacement, and improvement of facilities, structures, and equipment required by the Panama Canal Commission, including the purchase of not to exceed forty-seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only (including large heavy-duty vehicles used to transport Commission personnel across the Isthmus of Panama, the purchase price of which shall not exceed \$14,000 per vehicle); to employ services authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 3109); \$26,500,000 to be derived from the Panama Canal Commission Fund and to remain available until expended.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

##### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

##### INVESTMENT IN FUND ANTICIPATION NOTES

For the acquisition, in accordance with section 509 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976, as amended, and section 803 of Public Law 95-620, of fund anticipation notes, \$35,500,000.

#### UNITED STATES RAILWAY ASSOCIATION

##### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses to enable the United States Railway Association to carry out its functions under the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$2,100,000, of which not to exceed \$500 may be available for official reception and representation expenses.

#### WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

##### INTEREST PAYMENTS

For necessary expenses for interest payments, to remain available until expended, \$51,663,569: *Provided*, That these funds shall be disbursed pursuant to terms and conditions established by Public Law 96-184 and the Initial Bond Repayment Participation Agreement.

#### TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Department of Transportation shall be available for maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of liability insurance for motor vehicles operating in foreign countries on official departmental business; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

Sec. 302. Funds appropriated for the Panama Canal Commission may be apportioned notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1341), to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases for officers or employees as may be authorized by administrative action pursuant to law which are not in excess of statutory increases granted for the same period in corresponding rates of compensation for other employees of the Government in comparable positions.

Sec. 303. Funds appropriated under this Act for expenditures by the Federal Aviation Administration shall be available (1) except as otherwise authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 236-244), for expenses of primary and secondary schooling for dependents of Federal Aviation Administration personnel stationed outside the continental United States at costs for any given area not in excess of those of the Department of Defense for the same area, when it is determined by the Secretary that the schools, if any, available in

the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents and (2) for transportation of said dependents between schools serving the area which they attend and their places of residence when the Secretary, under such regulations as may be prescribed, determines that such schools are not accessible by public means of transportation on a regular basis.

Sec. 304. Appropriations contained in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS-18.

Sec. 305. None of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Panama Canal Commission may be expended unless in conformance with the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977 and any law implementing those treaties.

Sec. 306. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used for planning or construction of rail-highway crossings under section 322(a) of title 23, United States Code, or under section 701(a)(5) or section 703(1)(A) of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 at the—

(1) School Street crossing in Groton, Connecticut; and

(2) Broadway Extension crossing in Stonington, Connecticut.

Sec. 307. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

Sec. 308. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to assist, directly or indirectly, any State in imposing mandatory State inspection fees or sticker requirements on vehicles which are lawfully registered in another State, including vehicles engaged in interstate commercial transportation which are in compliance with Part 396—Inspection and Maintenance of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Sec. 309. None of the funds contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Sec. 310. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, total amounts of contract authority authorized for fiscal year 1986 in section 21(a)(2)(B) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, shall be available for obligation through fiscal year 1989.

Sec. 311. None of the funds in this or any other Act shall be available for the planning or implementation of any change in the current Federal status of the Transportation Systems Center.

Sec. 312. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive Order issued pursuant to existing law.

Sec. 313. (a) For fiscal year 1986 the Secretary of Transportation shall distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways by allocation in the ratio which sums authorized to be appropriated for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction which are apportioned or allocated to each State for such fiscal year bear to the total of the sums authorized to be appropri-



ated for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction which are apportioned or allocated to all the States for such fiscal year.

(b) During the period October 1 through December 31, 1985, no State shall obligate more than 40 per centum of the amount distributed to such State under subsection (a), and the total of all State obligations during such period shall not exceed 25 per centum of the total amount distributed to all States under such subsection.

(c) Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) provide all States with authority sufficient to prevent lapses of sums authorized to be appropriated for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction which have been apportioned to a State, except in those instances in which a State indicates its intention to lapse sums apportioned under section 104(b)(5)(A) of title 23, United States Code.

(2) after August 1, 1986, revise a distribution of the funds made available under subsection (a) if a State will not obligate the amount distributed during that fiscal year and redistribute sufficient amounts to those States able to obligate amounts in addition to those previously distributed during that fiscal year giving priority to those States having large unobligated balances of funds apportioned under section 104 of title 23, United States Code, and giving priority to those States which, because of statutory changes made by the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981, have experienced substantial proportional reductions in their apportionments and allocations.

(3) not distribute amounts authorized for administrative expenses and the Federal Lands Highway Programs.

SEC. 314. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than one hundred and five political appointees in the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 315. Not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds provided in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for the necessary expenses of advisory committees.

SEC. 316. The limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 1986 shall not apply to obligations for the remaining approach and bridge removal work necessary to complete the new bridge alignment for the Zilwaukee Bridge.

SEC. 317. Section 5(b)(2) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "Any funds apportioned for fiscal year 1982 or 1983 under subsection (a) for expenditure in an urbanized area with a population of less than 200,000 may be expended in an urbanized area with a population of 200,000 or more."

□ 1700

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PICKLE

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. PICKLE:  
Amend Section 317 by:

Adding the following new Subsection (b):

(b) Section 5(c)(4) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 amended by striking the period at the end of the first sentence, and inserting the following: "except that any fiscal year 1982 funds

made available to a Governor under section (b)(2) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, that are unobligated as of October 1, 1985, or become unobligated thereafter, shall remain available for expenditure under section 5 until October 1, 1986."

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely clarifies the intent of the committee that section 5 UMTA money allocated to a State's Governor may be spent in urban areas over 200,000.

To explain, section 5 is the pre-1983 UMTA Special Revenue Sharing Program. The Congress replaced the section 5 program with a new program in the 1982 Mass Transit Act.

Thus, since fiscal year 1982, a small amount of section 5 money, originally given to a Governor to spend in cities under 200,000 is unspent, because these areas do not have mass transit programs.

In section 317 of the committee bill, the committee allows a Governor to spend this fiscal year 1982 and fiscal year 1983 section 5 money in urban areas over 200,000 if there is a mass transit need.

Unfortunately, it is late in the fiscal year and the committee's intent may be defeated by the clock as far as fiscal year 1982 funds are concerned because on October 1, these funds are to be spent by DOT under the new program.

Specifically, my amendment allows the fiscal year 1982 funds allocated to a Governor to be spent under section 5 until October 1, 1986, just like the fiscal year 1983 money.

UMTA has no objections to the committee amendment or my clarifying amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have studied the amendment. It is a worthwhile amendment. It serves a useful purpose.

Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have also examined the amendment. It is a good amendment. We accept the amendment.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank both of the gentleman very much. I am grateful for their cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 318. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, within 60 days of the effective date of this Act the Urban Mass Transportation Administration shall reapportion under section 9 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, those funds available for reapportionment pursuant to subsection (c)(4) of section 5 of that Act.

SEC. 319. None of the funds in this or any other Act shall be made available for the proposed Woodward light rail line in the Detroit, Michigan, area until a source of operating funds has been approved in accordance with Michigan law: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to alternatives analysis studies under section 21(a)(2)(B) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended.

SEC. 320. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall, with regard to the Discretionary Grants Program of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, within 30 days after the enactment of this section, issue a letter of intent and enter into a full funding contract with the Southern California Rapid Transit District for \$429,000,000 to complete the Minimum Operable Segment, MOS-1, of the Downtown Los Angeles to the San Fernando Valley Metro Rail Project: *Provided*, That the \$429,000,000 shall include \$11,800,000 earmarked for fiscal year 1984, \$117,200,000 earmarked for fiscal year 1985, \$130,000,000 in fiscal year 1986 and, subject to the availability of funds from Congress, \$170,000,000 in subsequent fiscal years.

(b) The Urban Mass Transportation Administration shall enter into a contract with the Southern California Rapid Transit District to conduct a study of the potential methane gas risks relating to the proposed alignment of the Metro Rail Project beyond the Minimum Operable Segment, MOS-1. The study shall develop alternative alignments and appropriate environmental documents so that construction will not penetrate the "potential risk zones" and "high potential risk zones" as defined by the Task Force Report on the March 24, 1985, Methane Gas Explosion and Fire in the Fairfax Area, City of Los Angeles. The study shall be completed no later than nine months after the date of enactment of this legislation. Funds for this study, in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000, shall be made available from funds previously allocated for the MOS-1 project, commencing within 30 days of enactment.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] indicate which of his amendments he is offering?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that would be before us would be the amendment printed in the RECORD. That amendment will be modified, and I will discuss the modifications which I desire.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. WAXMAN: Page 41, strike out line 14 and all that follows through page 42, line 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) None of the funds described in subsection (a) may be made available for any segment of the Downtown Los Angeles to the San Fernando Valley Metro Rail Project unless—

(1) the Southern California Rapid Transit District establishes an independent committee of experts to conduct detailed studies of the entire Metro Rail Project route and the potential hazards associated with the occurrence of methane gas;

(2) before the expiration of the 9-month period following the date of the enactment of this act, the committee established under paragraph (1) submits recommendations to the Southern California Rapid Transit District regarding any adjustments in the Metro Rail Project route that are required to avoid tunneling into or through any area where the occurrence of methane gas presents a potential hazard;

(3) the Southern California Rapid Transit District submits to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration binding plans that—

(A) incorporate the recommendations of the committee submitted under paragraph (2); and

(B) indicate that no part of the Metro Rail Project will tunnel into or through any zone designated as a potential risk zone or high potential risk zone in the report of the City of Los Angeles dated June 10, 1985, and entitled "Task Force Report on the March 24, 1985 Methane Gas Explosion and Fire in the Fairfax Area"; and

(4) the Urban Mass Transportation Administration approves such plans.

Mr. WAXMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman reserves a point of order.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, is this the amendment that has been made in order under the existing rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has reported the amendment that is in order under the existing rule.

Ms. FIEDLER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us is an amendment made in order under the rule, and I will seek a modification of that amendment in order to have it comply with an agreement that we have worked out and which we will discuss shortly.

But let me explain the problem as to why we are discussing this issue at all.

For some years now in Los Angeles we have been trying to get a rapid transit metrorail system. The process has taken years—in fact, over a decade. Last year, we appropriated

money for the project and yet the construction has not yet started.

I have been a supporter of the metrorail system, and I continue to be a supporter of the metrorail system. However, in March of this year in an area that would be envisioned by the original route of the metrorail system, there was an explosion. None of us thought at first that there would be any particular connection with the metrorail, but the reality was that this explosion was due to methane gas in that area. The mayor of our city appointed a task force. The task force went out to find out why the explosion took place. The designated two areas: a potential high risk area surrounded by a potential risk area.

We have been concerned about the idea of tunneling through that area. We have had a conflict in testimony.

Some experts say, "Well, sure, it is a risky area, but we can do it safely."

Others have told us in the testimony that we received at a hearing that I held for my subcommittee in June of this year that the construction of such a subway system is fraught with peril. One witness described that if they hit an expected methane gas pocket, it could be like a fireball, costing the lives of the people working on that system.

Well, it seems to me foolhardy to tunnel through an area and take that kind of a risk to the workers involved, and later to the people that will be riding that metrorail system and to the surrounding community, the people living in the surrounding community.

We have proposed to everyone involved that we must accomplish three results: First, to avoid penetrating through this risky area because we did not think it made any sense to continue the idea of tunneling through an area where there is a risk.

Second, the city task force looked at this area and said there is a risk here but there may well be a risk as great in other areas along the metrorail route.

The only reason that they have not looked at the rest of that route is because they have only had an explosion in one part of that route.

We have said there has to be a reevaluation of the safety in light of this explosion, in light of the fact that we know now about the danger of methane gas along that route.

Further, we said there has not only to be a reevaluation but it has to be done independently of the people who insist they can go forward safely.

What our amendments would do is, first of all, ask my colleagues to join in making clear that the language offered in the committee by my friend and colleague, Mr. Dixon, that would call for a rerouting of that subway system out of that risk area be, in fact, guaranteed. Second, we have asked

that a study be done of the safety of the route, particularly the second segment of the route. The amendment would further clarify that part.

Now, I have genuine concern about the first segment of the metrorail system as well. However, while the amendment that is before us would require that funds not be dispensed, construction not begun, and other limitations be made on the metrorail system until such time as they reevaluate the safety of the first section, we have been convinced that to put this in the statute may well be harmful to the progress of metrorail finally getting started. So we have agreed to ask the transportation committee of the city of Los Angeles, the city council, to convene an independent committee of technical experts comprised of 10 people, 2 of whom we would be permitted to recommend to be on that committee. The technical committee would deliberate on the question of methane gas safety and whether tunneling is unsafe in that first MOS segment. Their deliberations would be open to the public.

Councilwoman Pat Russell from the city of Los Angeles, who is chairman of that city council committee, would appoint the chair of the technical committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WAXMAN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WAXMAN. The councilwoman would appoint the chair of the technical committee, and the technical committee would establish its own rules.

The technical committee would report to the transportation committee of the city council in a public hearing, and that committee, the transportation committee of the council, would adopt findings or take whatever action they deem appropriate. The technical committee and the transportation committee would complete that work, their work, by December 31, 1985. This would be a response to a letter that Congressman Dixon and I would send to Councilwoman Russell.

The reason this makes sense to us is, what we want is a second look into the safety issue before tunneling begins, before construction starts.

Let us look at it again from a technical point of view. Let us reevaluate this whole matter in light of the fact that we have had an explosion. Then let us have someone who is politically accountable to the public deal with that technical committee's report. Let them do it in the sunshine and open to the public of the people of Los Angeles so that they may be able to participate and understand what decisions are being made.



If we can accomplish that result for the first segment, a study of the continued route thereafter which will provide for reports annually to the Congress of the United States so that we will have those reports before any other appropriation would be made to metrorail and an assurance that we will not be tunneling through an area that is already designated as risky by the city task force, it seems to me we ought to then go forward with a proposal that has come out of the Appropriations Committee.

Now, in a minute, Congressman Dixon will be introducing a substitute which would bring this proposal that is before us into conformity with exactly the points that I have raised.

I would like to engage Mr. Dixon in a colloquy before he takes that step and ask him to confirm the statements that I have made as to what will be undertaken with respect to the evaluation of the first segment by the transportation committee of the Los Angeles City Council and his understanding of the way that we have presented to this Committee of the Whole the procedure in dealing with the metrorail.

□ 1715

Mr. DIXON. Yes, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIXON. The gentleman is correct when he indicates that in a moment I will be offering a substitute amendment to Mr. WAXMAN's amendment, and you are certainly correct in saying that we are all concerned with the safety of the metrorail project that the Transportation Committee, under the direction of Congressman LEHMAN, has provided funds, for in this bill.

The gentleman is also correct in saying that we have reached an agreement outside of the legislation to independently ask the chairman of the Transportation Committee to look into this matter by appointing a technical committee, of which you have two representatives, and that they will make a finding or report back to the Transportation Committee, and that that Transportation Committee will make a finding.

Where we have disagreed from time to time as good friends is to the whole issue of safety; and although I am agreeing because I think certainly 10 ounces of prevention is worth it under the circumstances, I want to make it clear that I still maintain that the metrorail system is safe, particularly MOS-1.

I certainly agreed to offer an amendment in the full committee which the gentleman is perfecting here that makes it clear that those high potential risk zones will not be tampered with in any way, shape, or form.

The gentleman and I would differ, though, as it relates to understandable concern, because I would indicate to the gentleman that the explosion had nothing to do with metrorail. Everyone should understand that there is no construction going on.

To me, although the gentleman would disagree, the similarity between metrorail and the explosion was in fact that there is methane gas there that in the tunneling we will have to deal with; we are not going to go through the area, so we will not deal with it; but to me, that is the only similarity.

Obviously, the reports that have been done indicate that there can be tunneling safety.

Mr. WAXMAN. If I might reclaim my time, just to add a few points, Mr. Chairman.

I hope the gentleman is correct; I know he is as concerned as I am about safety, as is Mayor Bradley and everyone else involved in supporting the metrorail system.

I cannot tell the gentleman it is unsafe. I would not seek to make that claim. What I believe must be done is that we take a look at this thing again in light of the fact that we have had an explosion.

When we did look at it again, we found that metrorail's consulting engineers classified the rail alignment into regions designated "high level hazard"; "medium level hazard"; and "low level hazard."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WAXMAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WAXMAN. According to the consultants, the hazard designation was based upon the concentration and pressure. Six stations were designated by the engineers as high level hazards, including three stations in MOS-1; the Civil Center station, the Fifth and Hill station, and the Seventh and Flower station. There are only five stations in MOS-1, and three of them are, or 60 percent have been characterized as "high level" hazards by metrorail's own engineers.

Yesterday, the principal engineer with the State said readings were high.

Our compromise would require a reevaluation in light of these facts, to determine the safety of the route. If in fact it is as safe as we hope it will be, then that reevaluation could be completed and we can go forward.

I am not saying it is unsafe. I am not convinced it is safe; I am convinced that when it comes to a question of safety, that should be our paramount concern, and we should sometimes step back and have an independent reevaluation of those safety concerns by technical people.

Ultimately, the decision is not one of engineers and geologists; it must be a decision by a publicly elected official,

and that is why we would have the city council people review that as well, and adopt their findings.

So I am hopeful that we can reach the conclusion and join together with everyone in giving the assurances that some people feel comfortable to give at this time but which this gentleman does not feel able to join in, in absolute assurance that the project will be safely constructed.

The issue is whether it can be safely constructed, not whether the area is hazardous; the area is hazardous, and we hope that the methods of construction in that first segment will allow us to feel that we can go forward and not be concerned that an unforeseen event costing people's lives might occur.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DIXON AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIXON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN: On page 41, section 320(b) strike lines 19-25 on page 41 through the period on page 42 line 1 insert the following: None of the funds described in subsection (a) may be made available for any segment of the downtown Los Angeles to San Fernando Valley Metro Rail project unless and until the Southern California Rapid Transit District officially notifies and commits to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration that no part of the Metro Rail project will tunnel into or through any zone designated as a potential risk zone or high potential risk zone in the report of the City of Los Angeles dated June 19, 1985 entitled "Task Force Report on the March 24, 1985 Methane Gas Explosion and Fire in the Fairfax Area."

#### POINT OF ORDER

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state her point of order.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment violates clause 2, rule XXI. It is legislation in an appropriations bill, and it has not been previously cleared by the Rules Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman have anything further to add?

Ms. FIEDLER. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, based on the existing rules, that this was not cleared by the Rules Committee; that there was a specific amendment or a lesser amendment which was acceptable by Congressman WAXMAN, and that any amendment which might be brought by another Member was not cleared by the Rules Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I might, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is recognized.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would contend that the point of order should not be sustained; that the amendment is a perfecting amendment to the amendment that had been approved by the Rules Committee for the purposes of the waiver.

The substitute amendment that is before us is legislating in no other way than what had already been approved for the purpose of the waiver by the rule that was adopted by the House.

Under those circumstances, as a perfecting amendment, legislating in no greater extent than the original amendment, it is consistent with the rule adopted.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, in all due respects to the viewpoint expressed by my colleague, this is a substitute amendment, not a perfecting amendment, and consequently reflects a totally different approach to the entire project; and consequently it is, in my opinion, supportive of the violation of the point of order, and the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. (Mr. SHARP). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair would indicate that under the rules and precedents, when a waiver is granted by the Rules Committee against an amendment to a general appropriation bill containing legislation, a substitute or a perfecting amendment thereto is in order as long as it only perfects the protected amendment without proposing additional legislation. And such is the case in this instance; the substitute does not enlarge upon what has been made in order by the Rules Committee.

So the Chair would overrule the point of order.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. FIEDLER. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. FIEDLER. If it is true that a perfecting amendment which was not made in order under the Rules Committee by a Member who did not seek a waiver of the existing rules was acceptable, would an additional amendment be reportable under the same concept for another Member dealing with the same general issues?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would have to evaluate each amendment as the substance of the amendment was before the Chair, as to its relationship to the original Waxman amendment.

The Waxman amendment was made in order by the rules; it is subject to perfecting amendment; and the Chair would simply have to evaluate amendments that are offered to it to determine whether those would be germane or contain further legislation.

Ms. FIEDLER. One further inquiry if I may, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized.

Ms. FIEDLER. Is the amendment now before the House considered to be the Waxman amendment, or is it the Dixon amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment that has just been read is of course the substitute amendment offered by Mr. Dixon to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Ms. FIEDLER. I thank the Chair.

□ 1725

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] has given you an adequate overview of the situation. This amendment is a perfecting amendment, because it clearly will delineate the area in which the rapid transit system to be developed in Los Angeles will not enter. Basically, there are two zones in Congressman WAXMAN's area labeled "high potential" and "potential risk zones" by the Los Angeles City task force. Although I offered an amendment in the committee, which I feel does the same thing, Mr. WAXMAN felt that this language would in fact perfect that, and so I am pleased to offer this amendment.

I would indicate that I have prior to this received a letter from RTD indicating that they found that my language was binding and would not enter into the area, but since there is some question, I would offer this perfecting amendment.

Let me say further that Congressman WAXMAN I think has been very articulate in making his case about safety. As I indicated before in a colloquy with him, we are interested in safety. I just want to point out that I feel that the preponderance of the evidence, the overwhelming amount of the evidence, from CALOSHA, RTD, from the city of Los Angeles, from the Fire Department of Los Angeles and the County Fire Department clearly spell out that, as it relates to MOS-1, it is perfectly safe. However, as Mr. WAXMAN correctly points out, in the effort to take that extraordinary step, we are joining together to ask the City Council Transportation Committee also once again to take a look at the safety and design measures.

I rise in strong support of the perfecting amendment, and I ask for an "aye" vote.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. FIEDLER TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DIXON AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. FIEDLER to the amendment offered by Mr. DIXON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN: Strike out the language of the substitute and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) None of the funds described in subsection (a) may be made available for any segment of the Downtown Los Angeles to the San Fernando Valley Metro Rail Project unless—

(1) the Southern California Rapid Transit District establishes an independent committee of experts to conduct detailed studies of the entire Metro Rail Project route and the potential hazards associated with the occurrence of methane gas;

(2) before the expiration of the 9-month period following the date of the enactment of this Act, the committee established under paragraph (1) submits recommendations to the Southern California Rapid Transit District regarding any adjustments in the Metro Rail Project route that are required to avoid tunneling into or through any area where the occurrence of methane gas presents a potential hazard;

(3) the Southern California Rapid Transit District submits to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration binding plans that—

(A) incorporate the recommendations of the committee submitted under paragraph (2); and

(B) indicate that no part of the Metro Rail Project will tunnel into or through any zone designated as a potential risk zone or high potential risk zone in the report of the City of Los Angeles dated June 10, 1985, and entitled "Task Force Report on the March 24, 1985 Methane Gas Explosion and Fire in the Fairfax Area"; and

(4) the Urban Mass Transportation Administration approves such plans.

Ms. FIEDLER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, several years ago I brought an amendment to the floor of the House and gained the support of 135 Members of the Congress to strike funds for the metro-rail project in Los Angeles. I did that after considering the issue very much in depth and only with a great deal of soul searching. I did it because I was persuaded at that time that the project was simply too expensive for us to go forward with, that there were a number of major hazards along the route, including 1,200 underground oil wells, which I warned at that time had the potential to create an explosion either during the tunneling process or during the process of actually going through, since methane gas is odorless and sightless, and there had in fact been a history of clear-cut problems. During past history, people would go into their backyards and stick a shovel in their backyard, light a cigarette, and explosions would take place. That was not unusual in this area. So I decided to support an effort to cut the funds. I was not successful in that



effort, but I have been successful in encouraging the support of the Department of Transportation. So even though funds have been appropriated over the last several years, the Department of Transportation has not released those funds.

Now, this map which I have over here to my left gives a little bit of an outline as to why I honestly believe that we should not go forward with the project and specifically with the route, and the reason I am bringing forward the amendment is because I have confidence that at least it deals with one of the major factors that we have seen in the last few months.

What happened was that there was an underground explosion which took place along the route of the metro-rail, just a few yards from it, and 22 people were injured in Congressman WAXMAN's district. As a result of that, he became concerned. He obviously will speak for himself on the issue. I do not need to try to speak for him. But a hearing was held, and he expressed a very deep concern about some of the hazards which were created as a result of the methane gas.

This particular map shows you the route which is outlined in yellow. The dots which you see are the underground oil wells as identified by the Department of the Interior, many of which create what I believe to be a substantial hazard. These round spots with the triangles in the middle represent the areas that are the station, and in three of the five stations in the first 4 miles of this project they have identified significant hazard according to the RTD's own documents themselves. These are in the downtown Los Angeles area. They say that they would be designated as high level hazard.

Now, I am obviously deeply concerned about the safety of the people of Los Angeles, and I am convinced my colleagues are, those who support the original substitute amendment. I think that they are concerned based upon very good faith for the welfare of the people. But I also feel that for us to go forward and permit the approval of \$429 million for a project whose route is, in my opinion, unsafe, and, in the opinion of a number of experts who have looked at various areas along the route, simply is foolhardy on our part.

Now, when the project was first initiated, it was supposed to cost \$100 million a mile. They have not yet stuck a shovel in the ground. The project escalated to \$300 million a mile. And the project's first 4 miles will cost \$1.1 billion, which is what they originally claimed the entire 18 miles would cost.

I believe—and I believe there are a number of experts who agree with me—that there is significant concern. The Appropriations Committee has expressed their concern through the

language which they put into the bill but in my opinion has no teeth in it, because the RTD had the authority to originally devise a route which was safe. It is clear, in my opinion, that they want to build this project regardless of what the implication is regarding the safety of the people. They want to move forward with nearly a half billion dollars of public funds, without any reasonable assurance that the route is safe and that the public safety is going to be protected. I think that this is extremely unwise. I personally believe to risk this kind of hazard for public safety, when we know in fact that there has already been a serious accident along the route, is something that we simply cannot accept.

I would like to read to you the opinion of UMTA Administrator Ralph Stanley.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Ms. FIEDLER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. FIEDLER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Stanley said, in a letter which was sent to me on September 11:

As you know, funding for this project was not included in President Reagan's FY '86 budget because the funding currently available is totally inadequate to complete the proposed 18.6 mile system. It is estimated that approximately \$2 billion in Federal funds will be required to complete the project.

UMTA is very concerned about the project related safety issues raised by you and Congressman Waxman and feel it is only prudent that the activities outlined in your amendment occur before any consideration be given to providing Federal funds for the Los Angeles Metro rail project. Therefore, we fully support the amendment as currently worded.

The amendment that UMTA supports that is the substitute which I have offered.

I would like to read a little bit of additional language which comes from one of the investigative reports which was done for the city of Los Angeles task force report on the recent Fairfax explosion.

It says:

All evidence suggests that oil and gas seepage has increased steadily in the past years. How often and at what location a gas bubble can come to the surface cannot be predicted, meaning we simply do not know when this kind of problem might reoccur.

And I might add that within a year of the time of the explosion along the route, there has been testing done. In at least three locations of subway stations in the first 4 miles of metrorail construction, there are clearly identified spots of considerable hazard. It simply does not make sense to go forward unless the entire subway route is subject to a thorough investigation and review before any construction is begun.

I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I want to commend the gentlewoman. Certainly it is her leadership in this House that has, I think, resulted in trying to examine this project thoroughly, both from a safety standpoint and from a cost-benefit standpoint. Certainly what she has done in the past has been repeatedly proven to be the fact, and I think that, really, Los Angeles owes her a great debt of gratitude in the diligence that she showed in pursuing this. I certainly support her effort because she has been proven so correct in the past.

Ms. FIEDLER. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his comments.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] insist upon his point of order?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further discussion on the amendment?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, recognizing the fact that it is an amendment with which I have been associated until the very recent times. And I want to explain to the Members why I decided that it is not an appropriate amendment for us to adopt.

The amendment would place a number of very severe limitations on the whole metrorail system going forward and in ways that I do not think are appropriate, in light of the proposal that Mr. Dixon and I have agreed to, with others in Los Angeles, that we presented to the Members on the floor today and have outlined to the Members on the floor today that have been agreed upon to take place in the city of Los Angeles.

The arguments made to me why this amendment might harm metrorail's progress is that it conditions everything and would keep them from getting started and maybe even from getting their funding, to the point where they might lose out on the opportunity to go forward if there is a time delay. Not that there is a safety problem, but a time delay.

For example, this amendment would say they could not start construction on the first phase until such time as they have re-examined the whole route. Well, I think that makes sense, as a general statement, but they do not know the whole route, since they are going to be required to realign that route in order to avoid the potential risk in the potential high risk area.

Well, I think it should be reviewed for safety. And under our proposal it will be reviewed for safety. But it may not be accomplished in time for the

funding to be used for the construction of the first phase.

Now, I want to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. FIEDLER]. She has raised alone a number of important considerations for us to think about with respect to metrorail. She has been an opponent of the whole metrorail system. We have been together in raising concerns about safety, but our concerns only converge when we are talking about safety. Her desire would be to see the whole system not to be funded and not to be built. That is not my proposal. I want the safety considerations dealt with, and once they are dealt with, I would like to see metrorail go forward. I do not want to jeopardize that system.

So I must urge that my colleagues reject this Fiedler amendment, go along with the perfecting amendment offered by Mr. Dixon, so that we can deal with safety satisfactorily and still have a metrorail system that we need so desperately in the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAXMAN. Yes, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made mention of the fact that he had been associated with this amendment very recently.

Mr. WAXMAN. Yes.

Mr. WALKER. The Fiedler amendment is in fact precisely the language that the gentleman offered earlier to get this debate started, is that not the case?

Mr. WAXMAN. If I could reclaim my time, the gentleman is correct, but I wanted to point out the flaws in that amendment which brought me to the point of deciding to abandon that amendment and to change it in ways that would still allow metrorail to go forward and deal with those safety considerations. If I did not want metrorail to go forward, even after the safety considerations were resolved, I probably would say, "Well, let's put this roadblock in the way, and maybe another one as well, and maybe even strike the funds," which, of course, was Ms. FIEDLER's position in the last Congress.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will further yield, as this gentleman well knows, there is nobody who is better able sometimes to find the flaws of an amendment than the author of the amendment, so we thank the gentleman for giving us that kind of expertise. But if I understand the gentleman correctly, those of us who do have some reservation about this project going forward period would in fact probably want to support the Fiedler approach; is that correct?

Mr. WAXMAN. I am not sure of that. Some may want to go along with that approach, some may want to ask that the funds not be authorized or appropriated. There are other procedural remedies to put forward the views that different Members have with regard to the metrorail system. So I would not seek to suggest how people ought to vote on this amendment except if you want metrorail and you want it done safely, constructed safely, then stick with the proposal that Mr. Dixon and I are putting forward, because I think we will be able to give you greater assurance that we will accomplish both.

This amendment would give you greater assurances of safety but it may not give you assurances that after that we will still have a metrorail.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1740

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous-consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to section 320(b) end in 15 minutes, at 5:55 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am trying to make certain, if there is a limitation on the debate, that equal time is divided between my view and the opposing view.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would include that as part of my unanimous-consent request, that the time be equally divided.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Accordingly, debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto shall end at 5:55 p.m.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] will be recognized for 7½ minutes, and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. FIEDLER] will be recognized for 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Fiedler amendment and in support of the substitute by Mr. Dixon to the Waxman amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to speak briefly in opposition to the Fiedler amendment and in support of the Dixon amendment.

Again, we are dealing here with a complicated and subtle situation. We have an amendment that was originally offered by my colleague from California [Mr. WAXMAN] who, after careful consideration thought an analysis and detailed deliberations with a variety of people on this issue, came to the conclusion that that original amendment was overkill, and that in fact there is a ground that is now reflected in the Waxman-Dixon proposal that would in fact legitimately address the safety concerns but would not be using a shotgun or a sledgehammer in order to address those particular concerns.

I worry that the Fiedler amendment, which goes back to much stronger language, goes well beyond what I think has become a well-crafted, more narrow approach, but one that does two things that both must be done. On the one hand, the Dixon-Waxman language does deal with the safety concerns. It does deal with them comprehensively, effectively and thoroughly. On the other hand, it does not do it in such a way that it is likely to kill the entire project. I think it is very important that we be very clear what language we are focusing on.

I happen to come from a district adjacent to the district in which this methane gas issue arose. I have paid very careful attention to it as a Representative of the Los Angeles area. I have been deeply concerned about the safety issues. I think that the issues that both Ms. FIEDLER and Mr. WAXMAN have raised are extremely important issues. But I do think in dealing with the specific safety concerns emanating from Mr. WAXMAN's district, and emanating from the explosion that occurred, those safety concerns are dealt with properly by the Dixon-Waxman amendment, going further, going to the Fiedler amendment goes beyond what is necessary and in fact I think is clearly understood by all of us to be an effort to throw a significant roadblock into the project itself.

So I do not think we need a sledgehammer or a shotgun at this point. We need a rifle, a careful, analytic, well-crafted compromise, and I think that that is what the Dixon-Waxman language will provide. I would urge my colleagues to reject the Fiedler language, however well intentioned it may be, to reject the Fiedler language and to accept the Dixon-Waxman compromise.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments made by my colleague from California; however, I have a very different perspective on this issue. Ordinarily, when a project begins and is



funded, it is clearly understood what the route is going to be. Somebody wants a project and they go out and evaluate the situation and they come back and they say we have got a specific route which we are going to go through. We know how much it is going to cost, we know what the problems are that we are going to encounter. We make a complete environmental impact report on the issue, and we go out and seek funding, which is what happened in this case.

But what has happened now is that that entire situation is totally changed. No longer do we know what the route is; no longer do we know what the real costs are going to be. No longer do we know what the real hazards are going to be, and so this Congress is being asked to finance to the tune of nearly half a billion dollars of taxpayer money a project where they do not know where it is going, and they do not know what the implications of the costs are going to be. That simply does not make rational sense to me, and frankly, up until a very short time ago, did not make sense to my colleague, Mr. WAXMAN, who wrote the amendment which I offer as a substitute.

I think that that condition continues to be the case. The RTD, who has the authority and the responsibility under the substitute from Mr. Dixon and Mr. WAXMAN offered today, are the same people who have the responsibility to evaluate the merits and the safety of the route all along. In fact, they put together an environmental impact statement on the issue but did not indicate the kind of extensive hazards which have since been proven to be the case along the route.

I would like to talk for just a brief moment, if I may, about some of the statements made in a hearing held by Congressman WAXMAN on June 14. This is what one of the engineering experts said:

In the construction of tunnels one is particularly concerned with explosive gases because of the confining atmosphere of the work area. To underline this point, one must only remember the Sylmar Tunnel explosion which killed 17 workers in June 1971.

It happens that Sylmar is in my district in the San Fernando Valley, a little distance away from this area. But typical of the kinds of problems that we have where methane gas exists.

Explosive gases underground are unpredictable. And the potential for unforeseen contact with these gases is always present, particularly in tunnels. An example of the unpredictability, despite the precautions, 2 years ago a small tunnel was excavated under the direction of my inspectors not more than 200 feet north of where this explosion occurred. Although the tests were conducted at least two times, each work shift, during the construction of that tunnel job, no gas was detected during the 1-month life of that job from July 10 to August 11,

1983, and yet, in March 1985 an explosion took place.

People were injured even though there had been an investigative job done along this route.

This is a very hazardous situation and I cannot argue strongly enough for support of this amendment. This amendment is not everything I would like it to be. If I had my way, I would offer an amendment to cut the funds. But since public safety happens to be my No. 1 concern as I believe it is with some of my colleagues, this amendment I believe strikes a reasonable balance between retaining the funding, not going forward with the funding until such time, and I underline that word, until such time as a safe and efficient route has been devised and proof of that route safety has been presented to the Department of Transportation and so approved. So that we can feel confident that rather than saying, "Hey, I did not know there was going to be a problem, and something happens, and we have to pick up the pieces and feel the sense of responsibility," I would not want that on my conscience and I hope my colleagues do not want it on theirs.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, like Ms. FIEDLER, like Mr. DIXON, like Mr. WAXMAN, I am very concerned about the safety of southern California and those who will be traveling in the Los Angeles Metrorail system. It is very rare, Mr. Chairman, that I would support a Dixon-Waxman compromise on almost any issue, but I must say that they have crafted a very strong compromise which will in fact assure the safety of southern California. I wish to strongly support the Metrorail. It is the best, most cost-effective new start imaginable, and I am very pleased with the compromise that they have assembled and I look forward to continued assured safety for southern California and its travelers.

□ 1750

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think everyone here on the floor, and I hope everyone who is watching through our communications systems, understands the issue here.

The gentlewoman from California [Ms. FIEDLER] has been opposed to Metrorail from the very first day. She has used every opportunity to have a vote on the Metrorail issue and has

been defeated on the issue at every opportunity. She uses a Sylmar explosion in 1972 that, in fact, makes Metrorail all that more justifiable.

Since 1972, we have not had one single explosion in California because of rigid guidelines in the performance of construction and monitoring. Since that time we have built over 60 miles of tunneling in methane gas areas.

The issue of safety has been addressed by an amendment by myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] by taking out those high-risk areas from the proposed route. MOS-1 will take 5 years to build, and in that interim period we have directed RTD to come up with an alternative modification that does not penetrate those routes.

This program is supported on this floor in a bipartisan way. It is supported by the Governor of the State of California, George Deukmejian. It is supported by the mayor of Los Angeles, the county board of supervisors, RTD, it has been supported by engineering and scientific studies around California, including Cal-OSHA and the department of mining.

So for someone to come on the floor and say that there is any uncertainty about the safety or the route, it seems to me at this point, when the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] and I have agreed to a formula to address his concerns, is an effort to defeat this issue.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. DIXON. No, I will not yield. The gentlewoman has had quite a bit of time. I have been yielded 4 minutes. I think it is inappropriate for the gentlewoman to take the 7 minutes and then I yield to her. I would like to make my statement and then sit down.

Ms. FIEDLER. The gentleman is entitled to make the decision, but I have the right to ask him to yield.

Mr. DIXON. I will not yield.

So, Mr. Chairman, at this 11th hour, a lot of give and take, concern by safety, a lot of support from people organizations, we have once again confronted an amendment to defeat the whole Metrorail program.

It is not unsafe, I maintain. I am taking that step forward. There are areas of high-risk methane coupled with pressure that can cause the combustion. We are not penetrating that route. It seems to me that Congress has acted on the Fiedler amendment time and time again, and I ask for a no vote on the Fiedler amendment, an aye vote on the Dixon amendment, and an aye vote on the Waxman amendment.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman just leaving the well indicated that he feels that the project is entirely safe, yet he offered an amend-

ment before the Committee on Appropriations—

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. FIEDLER. No, I will not for the same reason that the gentleman would not.

The gentleman offers an amendment in the Committee on Appropriations indicating that he is concerned about safety. At the same time, the amendment which he brings to the floor today, coauthored with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] also indicates that there are significant safety hazards.

I ask my colleagues to point their attention again to the map, if I may, which I brought out on the floor, and this, I might add, covers only a small segment of the route, and to look at the three spots that are in the red area. Those are three of the stations in the first 4 miles of the segment, each identified specifically by the RTD in their own documents as having hazardous levels of methane gas.

It is clear that there are problems there. As recently as just a few months ago there was an explosion, even though the gentleman claims that there has not been an explosion in years, since 1972. This entire debate has been generated because there was an explosion, and I might add that 22 people were injured in that explosion. So to try to claim that there is no problem, I think, is just totally untrue based upon the facts.

I would urge my colleagues that until such time as we are convinced that this project has a safe route, that this project is understood in terms of its cost, that my colleagues support my amendment. It is an appropriate amendment. Let us go forward with the investigation of a safer route which makes some economic sense and some security sense.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Ms. FIEDLER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 242, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

AYES—172

Archer	Badham	Barton
Armey	Bartlett	Bateman

Bedell	Hendon	Packard
Bentley	Henry	Parris
Bereuter	Hiller	Petri
Billakis	Hillis	Porter
Billie	Hopkins	Quillen
Boehlert	Hubbard	Regula
Boulter	Hughes	Ridge
Broomfield	Hyde	Ritter
Brown (CO)	Ireland	Roberts
Broyhill	Jacobs	Robinson
Burton (IN)	Jeffords	Roemer
Callahan	Johnson	Rogers
Campbell	Kasich	Roth
Carney	Kindness	Rowland (CT)
Chandler	Kolbe	Rudd
Chapple	Kramer	Russo
Cheney	LaFalce	Saxton
Coats	Lagomarsino	Schaefer
Cobey	Latta	Schneider
Coble	Leach (IA)	Schuetz
Coleman (MO)	Lent	Schulze
Combest	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Coughlin	Livingston	Sharp
Courter	Loeffler	Shaw
Craig	Lott	Shumway
Daniel	Lujan	Siljander
Daub	Lungren	Skeen
Davis	Mack	Slaughter
DeLay	Madigan	Smith (NE)
DeWine	Marlenee	Smith (NH)
Dickinson	Martin (IL)	Smith (NJ)
DioGuardi	Martin (NY)	Smith, Denny
Duncan	Mazzoli	Smith, Robert
Dyson	McCain	Snowe
Edwards (OK)	McCollum	Solomon
Emerson	McDade	Spence
Fawell	McEwen	Stallings
Fiedler	McGrath	Stenholm
Fields	McHugh	Stump
Fish	McKernan	Sundquist
Franklin	McKinney	Sweeney
Frenzel	McMillan	Swindall
Gekas	Meyers	Tauke
Gillman	Michel	Tauzin
Gingrich	Miller (WA)	Vander Jagt
Goodling	Molinar	Walker
Gradison	Monson	Weber
Green	Montgomery	Whitehurst
Gregg	Moore	Whittaker
Grotberg	Morrison (WA)	Wortley
Gunderson	Myers	Wyllie
Hall (OH)	Neal	Young (AK)
Hall, Ralph	Nichols	Young (FL)
Hamilton	Nielson	Zschau
Hansen	O'Brien	
Hartnett	Oxley	

#### NOES—242

Ackerman	Chappell	Fazio
Alexander	Clay	Feighan
Anderson	Clinger	Filippo
Andrews	Coelho	Florio
Annunzio	Coleman (TX)	Foglietta
Anthony	Collins	Ford (MI)
Applegate	Conte	Ford (TN)
Aspin	Conyers	Fowler
Atkins	Cooper	Frank
AuCoin	Coyne	Frost
Barnard	Crockett	Fuqua
Barnes	Dannemeyer	Gallo
Bates	Darden	Garcia
Beilenson	Daschle	Gaydos
Bennett	de la Garza	Gejdenson
Berman	Dellums	Gephardt
Biaggi	Derrick	Gibbons
Boggs	Dicks	Glickman
Boland	Dingell	Gonzalez
Boner (TN)	Dixon	Gordon
Bonior (MI)	Donnelly	Gray (IL)
Bonker	Dorgan (ND)	Gray (PA)
Borski	Dornan (CA)	Guarini
Bosco	Dowdy	Hatcher
Boucher	Downey	Hawkins
Boxer	Dreier	Hayes
Breaux	Durbin	Hefner
Brooks	Dwyer	Heftel
Brown (CA)	Early	Hertel
Bruce	Eckart (OH)	Horton
Bryant	Eckert (NY)	Howard
Burton (CA)	Edgar	Hoyer
Bustamante	Edwards (CA)	Huckaby
Byron	Englisch	Hutto
Carper	Erdreich	Jenkins
Carr	Evans (IL)	Jones (NC)
Chapman	Fascell	Jones (OK)

Jones (TN)	Murtha	Snyder
Kanjorski	Natcher	Solarz
Kaptur	Nelson	Spratt
Kemp	Nowak	St Germain
Kennelly	Oakar	Staggers
Kildee	Oberstar	Stangeland
Kleczka	Obey	Stokes
Kolter	Olin	Stratton
Kostmayer	Ortiz	Studds
Lantos	Owens	Swift
Leath (TX)	Panetta	Synar
Lehman (CA)	Pashayan	Tallon
Lehman (FL)	Pease	Taylor
Leland	Penny	Thomas (CA)
Levin (MI)	Pepper	Thomas (GA)
Levine (CA)	Perkins	Torres
Lewis (CA)	Pickle	Torricelli
Lightfoot	Rahall	Towns
Lipinski	Rangel	Traffant
Lloyd	Ray	Traxler
Lowery (CA)	Reid	Udall
Lowry (WA)	Richardson	Valentine
Lukens	Rinaldo	Vento
Lundine	Rodino	Visclosky
MacKay	Roe	Volkmeyer
Manton	Rose	Walgren
Martinez	Rostenkowski	Watkins
Matsui	Roukema	Waxman
Mavroules	Rowland (GA)	Weaver
McCandless	Roybal	Weiss
McCloskey	Sabo	Wheat
McCurdy	Savage	Whitley
Mica	Scheuer	Whitten
Mikulski	Schroeder	Wilson
Miller (CA)	Schumer	Wirth
Mineta	Seiberling	Wise
Mitchell	Shelby	Wolf
Moakley	Shuster	Wolpe
Mollohan	Sikorski	Wright
Moody	Sisisky	Wyden
Moorhead	Skelton	Yates
Morrison (CT)	Slattery	Yatron
Mrazek	Smith (FL)	Young (MO)
Murphy	Smith (IA)	

#### NOT VOTING—20

Addabbo	Hammerschmidt	Price
Akaka	Holt	Pursell
Bevill	Hunter	Stark
Crane	Kastenmeier	Strang
Dymally	Long	Vucanovich
Evans (IA)	Markey	Williams
Foley	Miller (OH)	

□ 1810

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Crane for, with Mrs. Long against.

Mr. FOGLIETTA and Mr. GALLO changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. FISH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address my colleagues on one particular aspect in the pending appropriations measure—that relating to funding for the Rail-



road Highway Crossings Demonstration Program. This is a section near and dear to the hearts of my constituents.

Permit me to begin by expressing my sincere appreciation to the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, the ranking member and my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and all members of this subcommittee for your continued support for funding the demonstration project located in Lincoln, NE. You have consistently recognized the pressing need we have to moderate the impacts of railroad crossings within our capital city, and you have been most generous in your support.

In May of this year, I appeared before the subcommittee to request \$6.9 million for elimination of a hazardous grade crossing conflict in Lincoln—the so-called K and L Streets extension. This amount actually reflected the shortfall in funding we received in last year's continuing resolution. I am delighted that the subcommittee and full Appropriations Committee accepted our request and that the pending bill earmarks the full \$6.9 million for the Lincoln project.

The urgency of proceeding with this project became even more apparent in June when a major train derailment knocked out a concrete support column from beneath an overpass on O Street, which is a main artery in the city. This bridge is the primary connection between downtown Lincoln and the western part of the city, with an average daily vehicle count of nearly 30,000.

As a result of the accident, the bridge has to be closed to all traffic for 5 days. This unfortunate accident graphically demonstrated the need for an alternate connection between west Lincoln and the rest of the community. During the closing of the Harris overpass, we had 20,000 to 30,000 vehicles being rerouted, many through residential neighborhoods, because there was no other reasonable and convenient alternative. The other connections to west Lincoln are all across railroad tracks and are frequently blocked by trains. We would have had major traffic congestion problems had we used one of these streets for a detour. The heavy traffic on residential streets created not only inconveniences to the people living in the area, but also caused serious safety concerns.

The K and L Streets extension which the committee bill will fund would have allowed local officials to reroute traffic without major inconveniences to the driving public and businesses and without significantly increasing the potential for traffic and pedestrian accidents in residential neighborhoods.

The K and L Streets segment is crucial to the development of southwest Lincoln. Presently, this section of the city is isolated from the central business district and other areas of the city by tracks which serve the high volume traffic of the Burlington Northern coal trains and other heavy freight carriers. At present, street travelers must cross over five sets of tracks, which carry an estimated 36 trains per day, most

of which are traveling 5 to 10 miles per hour, and average 100 cars in length.

The lack of convenient and safe access to this sector of the city has severely hindered its economic development. It also has posed a serious problem for emergency police and fire vehicles which need to traverse the tracks to get to the residents in the area. The police department estimates that at least one police vehicle per day on an emergency call is delayed by a train blockage. The fire department, with a one-truck station within the boundaries of the southwest section, experiences major train-created delays one to two times per month. Ambulance services personnel quoted an average of five calls per week which are held up by train crossings.

Lincoln's involvement in the railroad safety demonstration project has been a true partnership with the Federal Government. Thus far, 61 percent of the total demonstration project costs have been locally funded; the remaining 39 percent have been funded with Federal demonstration funds. It is an excellent partnership which should be continued until completed.

Thank you.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MOAKLEY] having assumed the chair, Mr. SHARP, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3244) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO SIT DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1985

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit at 2 on Thursday, September 12, 1985, for the purpose of holding a hearing on several bills that are intended to grant or restore coastwise trading and fishing privileges to a number of vessels.

The subcommittee will sit in markup of those bills immediately following the hearing.

The ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT] and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] have been apprised of the hearing, and markup date, and time, and are in accord with this request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1820

#### EDUCATION RALLY OF PUBLIC SCHOOL EMPLOYEES IN PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess, I had the privilege of attending a very successful rally for all public school employees in Prince Georges County. The rally's theme was "We are Education \* \* \* We Are America." Prince Georges County is one of the largest school systems in the United States. We have more than 12,000 outstanding teachers and staff. Too often their efforts and talents go unrecognized by the general public. The rally served to highlight the essential nature of their work for all of society and instilling them with the dignity their role deserves.

Dr. John A. Murphy, superintendent of schools for Prince Georges County, is to be commended for this wonderful idea and for his efforts in making it a success. The rally stressed the importance of the role of the teacher in informing, instructing, and inspiring our youth, without which, the future of our country holds no promise. I would like to include for the RECORD excerpts of Mr. Murphy's speech as well as remarks by people who capture the spirit of the rally, Mr. David Zahren, the Maryland finalist for the NASA "Teacher In Space" program and Mrs. Crista McAuliffe, the person designated to be NASA's first teacher in space. Mrs. McAuliffe sums it all up with her motto that says "I Touch the Future—I Teach."

The material follows:

#### SUPERINTENDENT MURPHY'S ADDRESS

Ladies and gentlemen, let me welcome you to our 1985-86 school year—a year that promises to be exciting in anticipation, rich in accomplishments, and a year of pride in our school system.

I believe that we stand literally at the threshold of a great advancement, all across America, in school buildings large and small.

In Prince George's County we have the chance to be right out in front of that advancement, on the cutting edge, proving to all the critics that public education works and works well.

As we launch this new school year we should do so as a united family of school personnel committed to a mission that says all children will have successful learning experiences.

I have used the term family in addressing you this morning because I want to emphasize that each of you is an important part of the guidance that our students will need as they are encouraged, admonished, cajoled, and led to successful educational experiences and fulfilled self esteem.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are not without crisis or problems in our school system, and as I outline them I hope you will come together with me and the members of the board of education in that common resolve to meet our problems head on.

We have made tremendous steps forward in our efforts to make Prince George's County public schools an example for other school systems throughout the Nation.

Overall academic achievement, as measured by standardized tests indicates improvement. However, there is a large segment of our student population that is not achieving the success we strive for.

A committee studying minority student achievement identified several items suggesting that black students in our school system, on an average, participate in educational programs, course offerings, and school activities that differ in kind and content from those of nonblack students.

Standardized tests show a significant gap in the measured achievement of black students throughout all grade levels.

The average standardized test score for black students was significantly below the average—20 percent or more percentile points—than for nonblack students.

In virtually every category, the data indicated the performance of black students was lower than the corresponding performance of nonblack students.

In addition, the committee also addressed the issue of whether there is a correlation between grades earned and student attendance. They found that—for black and nonblack students alike—the lower the average letter grade achieved, the higher the number of days a student is absent.

We intend to deal with the issue of absenteeism in our secondary schools. The board of education has approved a new attendance policy that reduces permissible absences from 10 to 5. Students who miss more than five classes without appropriate make ups will receive a grade of incomplete. It is our hope that this new policy will signal a clear message to students and parents that we expect them to be in school on a regular basis.

Clearly, the challenge before us is to accept the personal goal of elevating the performance level of all students—getting those who do not do well to do better, to level up. We must develop effective schools that will significantly eliminate gaps in achievement between black and nonblack students.

We can do this—not by lowering expectations for some but raising expectations for all. We must believe that all students have within them the capacity to do better.

We can increase student achievement not by criticizing the accuracy of the data but by discussing the implications of the data.

Data such as that gathered by the minority achievement committee will be available to all schools during the next school year.

Each school will be able to complete a valid needs assessment with statistical data concerning students attendance, promotion and retention, grade distribution, and individual student achievement.

Each school's needs assessment will disclose strengths and weaknesses and provide direction for the development of school improvement programs.

But those statistics will not tell the whole story. We will need to look in other directions, at other factors affecting student achievement.

Specifically, what a child can do is an issue of cognitive competency. It implies

ability, and refers to the child's motivation reflecting issues of interest, preferences, choice, and particularly rewards and punishments within the educational environment.

The question of what a child should do reflects the values and beliefs that are brought to the educational situation. In mainstream middle class America, the question of can has been paramount in analyzing the educational affairs of children. Whether a child should or will perform within the educational context is believed to be implicit.

The major point I want to make here is that there are other possibilities to the interpretation, understanding and meaning of low achievement scores, by both black and other students.

When a black student doesn't do it is not necessarily that he can't. As a school system, we must go beyond the questions of can and can not to issues of will and should.

We must deal with motivation, beliefs and values.

As the data are formally drawn together, we will make it available throughout the system.

It is my expectation that plans and strategies will be formulated at each school which will make positive differences in the levels of all students.

Designing, implementing and maintaining the individual school plan of action is the joint effort of all present today.

Our schools must remain equally committed to the inseparable goals of both excellence and equity for all students whether they be gifted or disabled, affluent or poor, black or white, English, or non-English speaking, male or female, handicapped or not.

As a public institution, each school in Prince George's County has a fundamental responsibility to promote achievement not only among the privileged students, but also those at the other end of the scale.

It should be the individual student, not the school, that is the focus of the total learning process.

The only real difference between quality and equality is the letter "e", and that may well stand for effort, and, eventually, the excellence to which all our schools aspire.

Fundamental to overall success is the overriding issue of public attitude.

Each of our family members has a critical role to play as we map our strategy for bringing our reputation as a quality institution to the fore.

Like it or not, our system has suffered from a negative public image; true or not, the perception is a reality to be dealt with.

Step one must be a change in attitude in our own family.

We have a system that is already good and one that has the potential of being the best.

Our public gets its primary information from each of our family members. They listen to our comments at home, in social gatherings, in church, at play, at community events—and gradually their perception of our school system evolves.

Each one of us in our dealings with a particular segment of the public are like chips in a mosaic. When they stand by themselves the contribution seems small but when viewed all together a picture emerges that can be a thing of beauty.

Let me now outline some of the specific strategies that we will employ to ensure improved learning experiences for all of our children.

We begin the 1985-86 school year with a new mission statement that clearly specifies the major purpose of our school system:

To assure that all students acquire the knowledge and develop the skills to enable them to become productive members of society.

Let me bring you up to date on our desegregation efforts, where we have been, where we are, and where we plan to be in the next four years.

This year we will open 12 new magnet schools. Six of these will have talented and gifted programs. The other six will be workplace schools, designed to meet the before and after school care needs of elementary age children.

In addition to these programs we will be supporting ten Milliken II schools. They will receive support over and above what the average school receives as compensation for keeping them predominantly one race schools, as agreed to in our desegregation settlement.

The Milliken II schools will have lower pupil/teacher ratios, additional counseling services, and computer laboratories.

Dr. James Comer, Associate dean of the Yale University Medical School, developed a program in New Haven, CT, that had a significant positive effect on the achievement of black children.

Dr. Comer's model will be introduced this fall in the Milliken II schools. I was very impressed by Dr. Comer's work in Connecticut and I'm excited by the prospect of his working with our school staff.

Our initial response to the magnet schools has been overwhelming. The talented and gifted schools were filled the first week of advertising that program.

The workplace schools are running a little slower but we're fully optimistic that they, too, will succeed.

The overall success of our magnet plan is based on the effort that many of you provided. I thank you for the marvelous support that you gave this first phase.

Next year will call for additional schools to be added, and our 4-year plan calls for a total of 30 magnet schools.

Planning for next year's magnets will start immediately. We welcome suggestions and recommendations for our program from all staff.

At the high school level we will be introducing Project Success.

Project Success is designed to meet the specific needs of 300 ninth grade students who will come to the ninth grade with a history of under-achievement.

It will provide additional teaching positions, reduced class size, team teaching efforts and the use of a variety of instructional strategies. And, as a result, it will help students improve their achievement, attendance and attitude toward their education and the realization that they can be successful in school.

The model will be introduced to other high schools as its success is acknowledged.

While our political leaders speak in glowing terms of their expectations for our school system, their commitment has not always manifested itself in the support needed to accomplish that goal.

While we make our commitment to excellence and extend our energies toward this end, we must also convey to our political leaders that they, too, have an obligation to match that commitment with more than rhetoric.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have high expectations for this school system. I am confident that we can accomplish in Prince George's County what no public school system to date has accomplished.



Gathered in this arena this morning are over 11,000 of the most talented men and women serving any school organization.

We can combine our energies and make what has heretofore appeared impossible, possible; and, in so doing, I believe we can send a resounding message that will shake public education at its very foundation.

The potential for leading public education into the future is within our grasp. The choice is clearly up to you.

You can opt to be pessimistic, reactive, and join the few vocal naysayers who will continually find excuses for why we can't.

Or you can join me as we chart the course for how we can.

I invite each of you to join with me in whatever role you play in this large school family.

I want everyone involved, whether you work in the cafeteria, a classroom, an office, on a school bus, in maintenance, or as a clerk, a secretary, a custodian, a school principal, or from any other position in this vast enterprise.

Come as we turn the challenges that face us into opportunities that will enhance the lives of the young people who place their trust in us.

We can foster an environment in which every child can succeed.

We can focus on teaching and learning.

Because, we truly are good and getting better.

Simply stated, we are the future of America.

We are education. Thank you.

#### REMARKS BY MR. DAVID ZAHREN

Most of us in this hall this morning are getting ready to return to a classroom. There's that queasy feeling, that uncertainty, that shock when the first bell rings.

But there's one teacher here who won't be seeing the inside of a school for quite a while. She won't be grading any papers, she won't be worrying about attendance, and if she has to send anybody off to a principal's office, it's going to be one long trip!

And when she blasts off next January and conducts her lessons on that celestial blackboard, she's going to show this country something we've always known—that there is simply no greater responsibility, no job more demanding than what we do every single day.

When the President spoke to us 114 would-be astronauts at the White House, he reminded us—and teachers everywhere—why we choose to teach. His words were simple. He said, America's teachers are the preservers and protectors of our heritage. You save our past from being consumed by forgetfulness and our future from being engulfed in ignorance. Every new class is a new generation to whom you must transmit the treasures of our civilization. You give your students many facts and much knowledge, but your task is greater than that. Because with the facts you must impart the values that give them meaning and context—our most sacred values of human dignity and the worth of individuals.

The woman I'm about to introduce is just that kind of special educator.

Even though she must be wincing from hearing it too often, she does indeed have the right stuff. A bachelor's degree from Framingham State College in Mass., a master's from Bowie State, 12 years as a social studies teacher, 8 of which were spent right here in PG Co. at Thomas Johnson and Foulis Middle Schools, the creator of a course on the American woman, 25 years in

the Girl Scout program, and active fundraiser in her community.

NASA may tell you Christa that you really do need booster rockets to go into orbit, but with all the support and prayers and good will from us down here, I reckon you could just about float up there.

Prince George's County is very proud of you Christa and even though you now call Concord, NH home, we hope you'll remember your friends and former neighbors when you fly over Upper Marlboro next year.

#### SPEECH PRESENTED BY CHRISTA MCAULIFFE

Thank you. I'm delighted to be here where my teaching career began 15 years ago.

And, after 15 years, it still feels good to stand here and say, "I am a teacher."

I am glad that the Space Participant Program recognized teachers as good communicators, as people who had experience taking information and presenting it in an interesting format. Teachers touch all of us; we have all had teachers, been influenced by teachers. We can approach teachers and talk to them. When I was down in Houston at Johnson Space Center, one of the press conferences was opened up to the public. As we finished with the reporters' questions, students began to come up to the stage and ask us questions. I saw these students listening carefully to my every word and asking questions and I thought: It's working—the program is already working. Think of all the students you have seen in your years of teaching—what better way to get information out?

Teachers matter, teachers care. We infuse young minds with a thirst for knowledge. We dedicate ourselves to the task of educating people, both young and old. Teachers provide the link in the educational community for parents and students. Job descriptions, if written accurately, would thwart even the hardest soul from choosing teaching as a profession. So why do we do it? Why do we teach? Personal satisfaction, the feeling that we are performing a necessary service for society, love of knowledge, love of learning; the list is endless. What motivates us now and has motivated us in the past is strictly individual. Yet we all have a common goal to provide the best education we can in sometime adverse conditions.

Why does this happen? If we are performing such a valuable service, why isn't it readily and easily recognized? When you are dealing with education, as all of us know, there is no tangible end product. Education is so hard to define, to see. This doesn't make it less important than the builder who finishes a house, but it is harder to get the community to recognize its worth.

I see this year as a year of opportunity for education. The Teacher in Space Program has already started people looking positively at schools—what is going on in the schools? What are the new programs about? What is happening in the classroom? I see this as a year of awareness—to get the community involved and, in doing so, to elevate the role of the teacher to where it needs to be. A couple of years ago, I took a poll in my classes and asked students to tell me what careers they were interested in or preparing for. Out of 200-plus, I had three young people cautiously admitting that they might like to go into teaching. Just as we went into teaching, I would like to see young people make that choice today. I would like to see people feeling good about the wonderful profession they have chosen. I would like to see school boards, budget committees, and communities working hard together with

teachers to help make salaries competitive with other professions.

People have asked me if I plan to return to the classroom next fall. It's been my life for 15 years. I'll be at Concord High School in September 1986 because if the Teacher in Space doesn't return to teaching, something is wrong!

During this year, I hope to get students and teachers excited about the future because, after all, this space, this frontier out there, belongs to all of us. I hope to help make people aware that teaching is an exciting and necessary profession. I hope to challenge students to reach for the stars. If I can do these things, then I have done my job.

You people out there are my strongest critics, and that's OK; I don't mind being judged by my peers. You are going to be watching me carefully because I represent you and that is a tremendous responsibility. I know that you'll be challenging me. I often tell my students that we need a relationship based on mutual respect and the two things that I require of them are that they do the best they can, and that they be true to themselves. I figure that if I follow my own advice, we'll all be OK!

Last week, I received a present from a colleague of mine. She had seen a t-shirt she liked and had one made up for me. It's very special and I think it sums up the reason why all of us are here. It says, "I touch the future—I teach." Thank you.

#### IN SPACE RESEARCH TODAY—SEPTEMBER 11—IS AN HISTORIC DATE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, many members of the House may not be aware of the significance in space research of this date.

Today, September 11, 1985, a U.S. space vehicle will make the very first fly-through of the tail of a celestial comet. In fact, since we know so little about comets this could be a suicidal venture for the unmanned U.S. space vehicle which is involved.

The comet in question, by the way, is not Halley's Comet, which has been much in the news of late, and which appears only once in 76 years. I wasn't around for its last appearance, believe it or not; but I remember my Mother and Father telling me all about it. And, like many others, I am hoping to see Halley's Comet next spring—in the Southern Hemisphere, by the way. It is of course, the king of all comets.

Because of the budget crunch, however, the U.S. Space Administration was denied funds for a closer inspection of Halley's Comet. As a result, the only U.S. research involvement in the 1986 appearance will be a piggy-backed U.S. research module on a Soviet inspection vehicle next spring.

But, fortunately, there is another comet around, even though it is not visible to the naked eye, the Giacobini-Zinner Comet. It was this comet's tail that the Goddard Space Center decided to run the mission on, primarily because the Giacobini Comet

is in the neighborhood of the International Cometary Explorer, (a space vehicle) 44 million miles from earth.

That actual encounter took place in the heavens this morning at 7:02 a.m., and the vehicle stayed in the comet's tail for some 12 to 20 minutes.

Whether the space vehicle was consumed, or whether the comet's tail yielded up the secret of its composition, we won't know for some time. But it's an interesting and exciting idea.

Mr. Speaker, with the help of the Goddard Space Center, I include with my remarks a paper giving more explicit detail about comets and their behavior, which may make it easier for us to appreciate the exposure when Halley's Comet nears our Earth in 1986.

Also included is a helpful article on the Giacobini Comet and its historical adventure in space.

The article follows:

#### A LOOK INTO THE BEGINNINGS OF THE SOLAR SYSTEM

The NASA Spacecraft International Cometary Explorer (ICE) is fast approaching its intercept with Comet Giacobini-Zinner on September 11, 1985. This first satellite/comet encounter in history will provide scientists with their first look at the make-up and dynamics of a comet's tail. ICE was launched in 1978 as the International Sun and Earth Explorer and was redirected toward Comet Giacobini-Zinner in 1982. The satellite and comet are now closing at a relative velocity of 13 statute miles per second. Comet Giacobini-Zinner was discovered in 1900 and returns to Earth's neighborhood every 6½ years. It will not be visible to the naked eye but should be an easy target for small telescopes used by amateur astronomers.

Although much attention has been focused on the return of the legendary and famous Halley's Comet next year, the US spacecraft encounter with Comet Giacobini-Zinner will occur six months before the first foreign probes reach Halley's; and if ICE survives the force of the comet's tail, it too will eventually meet Halley's Comet, although nearly 19 million miles away at its closest approach. By then, ICE will be a veteran, the first man-made instrument to have visited a comet.

Comets are one of the great mysteries of the solar system and may hold the keys to understanding the solar system's birth and evolution. They are believed to be composed of the same materials as the primordial solar system, having been unaltered, either by volcanic eruption, melting, or the formation of crusts and cores; comets are a looking glass into the beginning of our universe.

Our best clues to what comets are made of come from studies of their visible comas and tails. The coma is a comet's temporary atmosphere, which forms a glowing cloud, more than 62,000 miles across, around the small, solid nucleus which is, at most, a few kilometers across.

From the coma, the comet's glowing tail stretches across the sky; some tails have been measured to be more than 62 million miles long. (For comparison, the distance from Earth to the sun is about 93 million miles.) The coma and tail are made up of dust, gas, and perhaps grains of ice that have been boiled off the main body of the comet (the nucleus) by the heat of the sun.

Despite the immense size of comet comas and tails, there is actually very little matter in them: they are so tenuous that stars can be seen through them. Virtually all the mass of a comet is in the nucleus—a body that has never been observed by astronomers as more than a pinpoint of light.

The most accepted model of what makes up a comet is the "icy conglomerate" (or, more informally, the "dirty snowball") model proposed in the 1950s by Professor Fred Whipple. According to this theory, the nucleus of a comet is a mixture of ices, silicate minerals, and possibly metals. The ices are solid, frozen substances that are usually liquids or gases under more familiar conditions. Comets may also contain complex carbon compounds like those observed in certain rare meteorites.

The fact that these "dirty snowballs" contain frozen gases suggests that they may have formed from ice-coated rocky grains in the outermost parts of the primordial dust cloud that collapsed to form the sun and planets; the solar system's outer planets may have been built up by the accumulation of such "snowballs," while the rocky inner planets were formed from asteroid-like bodies that had been sufficiently heated by the sun to lose all their volatile gases.

Once formed, both kinds of planets suffered an intense bombardment by the leftover comets and asteroids. The traces of this ancient battering still remain in places like the lunar highlands, the ancient terrains of Mars, and some satellites of the outer planets, like Callisto and Mimas.

All the inner (terrestrial) planets (except Mercury) acquired atmospheres, and there is a continuing debate over whether such atmospheres were produced mainly by gases released from planetary interiors or mainly by further cometary bombardment. Until the chemical composition of comets is known, we cannot tell how much of our own atmosphere came from comets.

If comets were once so abundant in the solar system that they could form huge planets, where are they now? Many of the original comets were probably used up in making the planets, but scientists think that the remainder were gradually scattered into the outermost solar system as a result of close encounters with the larger planets.

Some of these scattered comets are now believed to constitute a vast, invisible swarm, called the Oort Cloud, at the outer edges of the solar system about one-third of the way to the nearest star. In the Oort Cloud (named for the Dutch astronomer Jan Oort, who first proposed it), these comets have remained for billions of years in a cosmic "deep freeze." So far from the sun that their temperature never rises more than a few degrees above absolute zero, they are preserved against the destructive effects of solar heat and light. Our solar system's Oort Cloud of comets has never been observed. We can only infer that it is there from the orbits of present-day comets.

Why don't comets stay in the Oort Cloud? Because the cloud is so far out that the comets, while orbiting the sun, also feel gravitational tugs from other neighboring stars. As the sun moves among the other stars of our galaxy, one of them may occasionally come close enough to give a comet a gravitational nudge, changing its orbit so that the comet leaves the Oort Cloud and heads downward toward the sun.

As a comet falls toward the sun it begins to feel the sun's heat. Slowly the comet warms up; its outermost icy layers turn to gas, and the gas blows off the nucleus,

sometimes as sudden bursts and jets that drag dust and small icy chunks with it. The new-born cometary atmosphere reacts to the sun's light and the solar wind which first change the atoms and molecules of the gas to ions (that is, they acquire an electric charge) and then sweep the ions and dust away from the comet to form the familiar tails that, no matter how far they extend from the comet, always point away from the sun.

As the comet gets closer to the sun, the boiling off of material increases, and the coma and tail grow in size and brightness as the comet approaches perihelion, its closest point to the sun. After whipping around the sun at speeds that may approach 62 miles a second, the partially depleted comet heads out again on its long orbit to the Oort Cloud, not to return for perhaps another million years.

After being deflected from the Oort Cloud toward the sun, a few comets enter a second gravitational trap as they make a closer encounter with a large planet (usually Jupiter or Saturn) while either coming in or going out. Some of these close encounters cause the comet to be shot out of the solar system entirely, never to return. Other comets, however, are forced into small orbits that keep them entirely within the inner solar system—often between the orbits of Earth and Jupiter. These become the short-period comets, typically circling the sun in periods of 3 to 200 years.

Short-period comets are also short-lived comets. Each time they pass close to the sun, they lose more and more material, and over the centuries, as their ices are removed, they grow smaller and fainter. Eventually, a short-period comet may become completely moribund; its accessible gases are gone, and it no longer exhibits cometary phenomena. The ultimate fate of such a comet is uncertain: the object may fall apart, leaving a trail of dust along its orbit, or may exist as a tiny rocky skeleton with all its gas and ices gone, or may have another close encounter with a planet and be placed back into a long-period orbit again.

Comets are truly fascinating cosmic phenomena; and with the Giacobini-Zinner encounter this month and with the Halley's rendezvous next March, these celestial enigmas will be forced to give up a portion of their secrets.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1985]  
U.S. SOLAR SPACECRAFT RACES TO FLY IN COMET'S TAIL TODAY—ICE TO MEET GIACOBINI-ZINNER 44 MILLION MILES FROM EARTH

(By Thomas O'Toole)

A U.S. spacecraft put into space more than seven years ago to study the solar wind streaming off the sun was on target yesterday to become the first ever to fly through the tail of a comet in a possibly suicidal encounter.

The historic encounter between the International Cometary Explorer (ICE) and a comet known as Giacobini-Zinner is to take place 44 million miles from Earth at 7:02 a.m. EDT today, and will presage the encounters between other spacecraft and Halley's comet next March.

"This is a very risky mission," flight director Robert Farquhar said at the Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, where the comet encounter is being directed. "We are putting the spacecraft in harm's way, and there is a distinct possibility the spacecraft will not survive the encounter."



The most likely damage to the spacecraft would be to the solar cells that power it. A hail of dust or a rock the size of a bowling ball could come tumbling out of the comet's head and strike the spacecraft at high speed, cutting off all its power. The spacecraft has no protective dust shield and no cameras to see whether it is facing unintentional suicide.

Not everyone at Goddard was as pessimistic about the encounter as Farquhar. Project scientist Tycho von Rosenvinge said, "We are optimistic that we'll survive our flight through the dust tail. We don't think the dust tail is as dense as some people think."

Politics had a lot to do with the comet encounter. The mission to Giacobini-Zinner has its roots in the Reagan administration's 1981 decision not to mount a mission to Halley's comet, which is racing toward its 30th recorded encounter with Earth. The Soviet Union, the European Space Agency and Japan have instrumented spacecraft on their way to meet Halley's comet next March after the comet swings round the sun.

"By the summer of 1981, it was obvious that the United States would not be able to send a space probe to Halley's comet," Farquhar said. "It appeared that the United States would be the only major non-participant in the Halley sweepstakes."

Out of the gloom that there would be no U.S. mission to Halley's comet came a plan by Farquhar to use what was then called the International Sun-Earth Explorer 3 to intercept Giacobini-Zinner and save face. Even though the spacecraft has no cameras to photograph the comet and no instruments to analyze its dust tail, it has at least six instruments capable of measuring certain data about the dust and plasma tails.

It also was expendable and could serve as a "kamikaze" pathfinder for spacecraft flying missions to Halley's comet.

Farquhar said, "The spacecraft was launched in 1978 and had already completed the majority of its primary mission objectives. In addition, we found that the surcharge for sending the spacecraft to the comet would be less than \$3 million."

Farquhar and his Goddard team devised a way to maneuver the spacecraft away from its position about 1 million miles from Earth onto a path that would take it around the moon and back through the earth's geomagnetic tail. The spacecraft was maneuvered around the moon four times at a distance of 12,000 miles and a risky fifth time at a distance of only 75 miles.

The encounter with the moon gave the spacecraft a "slingshot" effect that flung it at high speed onto a path that would take it out of the gravitational pull of the moon, the Earth and the sun. It also sent it on a trajectory to intercept Giacobini-Zinner, needing only a few course corrections to target it right for the comet's tail.

Moving at almost 46,000 miles an hour toward the comet, the ICE spacecraft was less than a half-million miles from the comet at 6 p.m. yesterday. The spacecraft's heaters were turned off to save power so its 10 working instruments can send as much data as possible during the encounter.

The spacecraft also made a course correction over the weekend to aim it at a spot in the tail 5,000 miles behind the comet's head.

"We expect to spend a minimum of four to five minutes inside the comet's tail," von Rosenvinge said. "Our time in the tail could be as long as 12 to 20 minutes, depending on whether the tail widens or shrinks. Each comet has a personality all its own."

Giacobini-Zinner is no different. Discovered in 1900 by Michel Giacobini at the Nice Observatory in France and found again in 1913 by Ernst Zinner at the Remels Observatory in Germany, the comet visits the Earth's environs every 6.5 years and is easily observed by astronomers every 13 years when it swings close to the Earth on its way around the sun.

As comets go, it is not as spectacular as Halley's comet but is far from being burned out.

Its nucleus of primeval rock, ice and snow is about a mile across and the "coma" of exotic gas and dust that surrounds its nucleus is 50,000 miles across. Its yellow dust tail is about 300,000 miles long and its second tail of electrified gas, the plasma tail, is at least 1 million miles long.

Flight directors at Goddard have already witnessed some erratic behavior in Giacobini-Zinner. The comet wandered 1,000 miles off its predicated course last week.

To understand why a comet wanders, a comet can be looked at as if it were a speeding spaceship equipped with its own jet-like engines. In this case, the dust and gas being boiled off the comet as it swings close to the sun.

Comets blow off gas toward the sun, generating a thrust in the opposite direction like a balloon whose escaping air blows it across a room. The tiny thrusting motions that the escaping dust and gas give the comet's own rotation though space either force the comet to spiral away from the nearest celestial body or in toward it.

All this time, snow and ice are subliming off the comet's surface," John C. Brandt, chief of Goddard's Laboratory for Astronomy and Solar Physics, said, "The effect is like an upside-down snowstorm coming off the comet."

Goddard is going all out to communicate with the ICE spacecraft as it moves toward the comet's tail, enlisting the help of tracking networks in Australia, California, Spain, Puerto Rico and Japan to keep in touch with the spacecraft through the critical hours of encounter.

The tracking antennas were also equipped with the new low-noise amplifiers to pick up the weak signals expected from the spacecraft's 5 watt transmitter at a distance of 44 million miles.

"The spacecraft was designed to work at an Earth distance of 1 million miles," said Raymond J. Ambrose, manager of tracking and data acquisition for the U.S. Deep Space Network. "Giacobini-Zinner is almost 50 times that distance, which gives us 2,500 times less signal."

#### IOWAN HEADS AMERICAN LEGION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of my colleagues the election of a distinguished Iowan to head the Nation's largest veterans' organization. Dale L. Renaud, 53, of Bondurant, IA, was elected national commander of the American Legion at the closing session of the 67th Annual National Convention, August 28, 1985, in New Orleans. A U.S. Coast Guard veteran of the Korean war, he served 26 months overseas as an underwater soundman first class.

Following his discharge from active duty in August 1956, he became production supervisor for the Travelers Insurance Cos. and he currently is president of the MacRae-Renaud Agency, Inc., of Bondurant and West Des Moines, IA.

An active Legionnaire for almost 30 years, Renaud is a life member of the Samuel H. Bridge Post No. 396, Bondurant. He was State commander of the Legion in 1971-72 and served as national executive committeeman from 1979 to 1983. From 1983 to 1985, he was chairman of the American Legion's National Americanism Commission. A graduate in business administration from Simpson College, he has been active in the Lions Club, Christian Church, and the Masons. He served as chairman of the Iowa American Legion's Boys' State from 1964 to 1982. Renaud and his wife, Pat, who were married in 1959, are the parents of two daughters and a son.

Mr. Speaker, I can personally attest to the esteem in which Dale Renaud is held in my State for his leadership in veterans' and community affairs. I am confident he will give this same dynamic leadership to the American Legion as its national commander and will cooperate effectively with Congress and the administration in all efforts to improve the lot of the American veteran.

#### CONGRESSMAN FRANK ANNUNZIO ANNOUNCES RESULTS OF 1985 TAX REFORM SURVEY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce the results of a survey on possible changes in our tax laws I conducted recently to obtain the opinions of citizens residing in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am privileged to represent.

More than 10,000 questionnaires were completed and returned, and I want to express my appreciation to my constituents who involved themselves in the decision-making process by responding to this survey.

Ten broad questions were asked relating to various possible changes in current tax law, and the responses on the questionnaires were tabulated by computer. Before listing a numerical summary of the tabulation, I want to point out some significant reactions to several important tax issues.

Seventy-five percent of those responding indicated that they wanted to continue to deduct State and local taxes on their Federal tax returns, including income, property, and sales taxes; 70 percent wanted to keep the additional exemption for the blind and the elderly; and 70 percent did not want to tax health insurance for which their employers now pay.

An overwhelming 81 percent said that Congress should not cut taxes if doing so would raise the Federal deficit, while 89 percent said that the oil and gas industry should not receive preferential tax treat-

ment but should be treated the same as other industries, and 88 percent said that business should not be allowed to deduct the costs of entertaining clients.

On the issue of fairness versus simplification, an 87 percent affirmative vote was given to making sure that everyone pays a fair share of the tax burden. This particular question generated hundreds of letters written separately by many of my constituents who repeated time and again that fairness and equity should receive maximum consideration in making any tax changes.

My constituents also stated that the three main goals of tax reform should be: First, by 88 percent, that both businesses and individuals pay a fair share of the tax burden; second, by 60 percent, that complex tax breaks, giving unfair advantages to those who can afford to pay for expert tax advice, be eliminated; and third, by 38 percent, that additional revenue be raised to help reduce the deficit without raising individual income taxes.

The three goals of tax reform considered least important by my constituents were: First, reducing all tax rates, 66 percent; second, eliminating as many deductions and credits as possible, 48 percent; and third, making it easier for an individual to compute his or her taxes, 47 percent.

It is also interesting to note that of those who returned the questionnaire, 53 percent prepared their own tax returns and 72 percent itemized deductions.

The results of this tax survey are being made available to the chairman and members of the House Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over all tax legislation, in order that full consideration may be extended to the views expressed by my constituents by the members of the committee during their continuing deliberations on various tax reform proposals.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the completed tabulation of the survey according to percentages:

#### 1985 TAX REFORM SURVEY

1. Listed below are some of the many changes being proposed in tax law. Check those you would oppose, even if they would help make possible an overall reduction in tax rates.

a. Repeal the ability of people to deduct state and local taxes—income taxes, property taxes, and sales taxes—seventy-five percent.

b. Repeal the marriage penalty deduction—thirty-five percent.

c. Limit interest deductions, except for business loans and the mortgage(s) on your principal residence—forty-two percent.

d. Repeal income averaging—thirty percent.

e. Repeal the additional exemption for the blind and the elderly—seventy percent.

f. Repeal credits for energy-saving home improvements—thirty-four percent.

g. Tax a portion of employer-paid health insurance—seventy percent.

h. Tax increases in the cash value of life insurance policies—sixty-six percent.

i. Tax all unemployment compensation and payments for work-related injuries—fifty-five percent.

j. Limit deductions for work-related expenses, such as union and professional dues,

safety equipment, tools, uniforms, and travel—forty-three percent.

2. Should Congress cut taxes if doing so would increase the deficit?

Yes, 19%; no, 81%.

3. Should the oil and gas industry receive more favorable tax treatment than other industries in order to provide incentives for increased production?

Yes, 11%; no, 89%.

4. Should capital gains (profits from the sale of stocks, bonds and other investments) be taxed at a lower rate than wages and salaries to encourage such investments, or should they be taxed at the same rate as wages and salaries?

a. Lower rate—43%.

b. Same rate—57%.

5. Under the present system, tax rates for people with high incomes are higher than rates for people with lower incomes. Should tax rates for high income people be cut more than rates for low and middle income people so that there is less difference between rates for people with big incomes and those with smaller incomes?

Yes, 18%; no, 82%.

6. Should the 50% top tax rate (for joint return income in excess of \$175,000) be—

a. Kept at 50%—75%.

b. Cut to 45%—7%.

c. Cut to 40%—7%.

d. Cut to 35%—10%.

7. Should business be allowed to deduct the costs of entertainment, such as taking clients on hunting and fishing trips, to the theater, or to professional sports events?

Yes, 12%; no, 88%.

8. How much should businesses be allowed to deduct for meals at which business might be discussed?

a. The full cost—13%.

b. \$25 per person—19%.

c. \$15 per person—21%.

d. Nothing—47%.

9. The goals of simplification and fairness often work against one another because much of the complexity in the tax law is due to provisions designed to assure fair treatment for taxpayers with special circumstances. Given that fact, which goal is more important:

a. Simplifying the tax law, even if that results in less fairness—13%, or

b. Assuring that everyone pays a fair share of the tax burden, even if that means less simplification—87%.

10. What should be the main goals of tax reform? Of the Most/Least Important<sup>1</sup> nine goals listed below, which are the three most important (rank 1, 2, 3) and which are the three least important (rank 7, 8, 9)?

a. Make sure everyone, both businesses and individuals, pays a fair share of the tax burden.—88%/4%.

b. Reduce all tax rates, but cut rates for high income people more than rates for low and middle income people—8%/66%.

c. Reduce tax rates, but keep the differences between rates for higher and lower income people—22%/27%.

d. Leave the rate structure alone, but cut taxes by raising the personal exemption the standard deduction—32%/27%.

e. Make it easier for me to do my taxes—19%/47%.

f. Eliminate complex tax breaks that give unfair advantage to those who can afford high-priced tax experts—60%/24%.

<sup>1</sup> The first number is the percentage of respondents who ranked this item 1, 2 or 3. The second number is the percentage of respondents who ranked the item 7, 8 or 9.

g. Simplify the tax system by eliminating as many deductions and credits as possible, including those that are widely used by the average taxpayer—13%/48%.

h. Provide tax relief for the poor—20%/24%.

i. Raise additional revenue to help reduce the deficit—but without increasing individual income taxes—38%/26%.

11. Who prepares your taxes? I do—53%. My spouse—6%. Friend or relative—5%. A commercial tax service—12%. Lawyer/accountant—24%.

12. Do you itemize deductions? Yes, 72%; no, 28%.

The following information will only be used to analyze survey results and will be kept completely confidential:

13. Family income: Under \$10,000, 5%; \$10,000–\$20,000, 18%; \$20,000–\$30,000, 26%; \$30,000–\$40,000, 23%; \$40,000–\$50,000, 16%; Over \$50,000, 13%.

14. Personal information: Single, 21%; married, 79%; both spouses work, 24%; retired/unemployed, 29%; number in family, 2.88; age, 53.9.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING CURRENT LEVEL OF SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Chairman WILLIAM H. GRAY III, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I am submitting the official letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of spending and revenues for fiscal year 1985. Since my last report, the Congress adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1986 and revising the congressional budget for fiscal year 1985. Those revised aggregates have become the official House spending ceilings and revenue floor.

The current level report is used to compare enacted spending after the start of a fiscal year with the aggregate ceiling on budget authority, outlays, and revenues established in a budget resolution and enforced by point of order pursuant to section 311(a) of the act. The term "current level" refers to the estimated amount of budget authority, outlays, entitlement authority, and revenues that are available (or will be used) for the full fiscal year in question, based only on enacted law.

Now that we are operating under a revised budget resolution, both the aggregates and the estimates of current level reflect the economic and technical assumptions underlying this year's budget resolution, which of course are more up-to-date than last year's assumptions.

I should also note that the section 4(b) exemption in last year's budget resolution is no longer in effect. It applied only as long as the "automatic" second budget res-



olution for fiscal year 1985 was in effect, but that "automatic" second budget resolution is superseded by Senate Concurrent Resolution 32.

As chairman of the Budget Process Task Force, and on behalf of Chairman GRAY, I intend to keep the House informed regularly on the status of current level.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, September 11, 1985.  
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 30, 1976, the Committee on the Budget outlined the procedure which it had adopted in connection with its responsibilities under Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide estimates of the current level of revenues and spending.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 10, I am herewith transmitting the status report of budget authority, outlays, and revenues for fiscal year 1985. This status report compares current level to the budget aggregates in S. Con. Res. 32, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1986, adopted by the Congress on August 1, 1985. As you know, that budget resolution also revised the fiscal year 1985 budget resolution. The current CBO estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues now reflect the economic and technical assumptions that underlie S. Con. Res. 32.

It should be noted that the Section 4(b) exemption, contained in H. Con. Res. 280, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1985, no longer applies. That section provided an exemption to the Section 311(a) budget ceilings for committees that remained within their own "discretionary action" 302(a) allocation. According to Section 4(c) of H. Con. Res. 280 that exemption would cease to apply when a subsequent budget resolution is agreed to. Agreement to S. Con. Res. 32 by the Congress on August 1, 1985, fulfills that condition.

With best wishes,  
Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. GRAY, III,  
Chairman.

Attachments.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1985 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32

REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF SEPT. 5, 1985

[In millions of dollars]			
	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Appropriate level.....	1,062,100	946,300	736,500
Current level.....	1,062,100	946,300	736,500
Amount under ceilings.....			
Amount over ceilings.....			
Amount under floor.....			

#### BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority for fiscal year 1985, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in S. Con. Res. 32 to be exceeded.

#### OUTLAYS

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority for fiscal year 1985, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate

level of outlays for that year as set forth in S. Con. Res. 32 to be exceeded.

#### REVENUES

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss for fiscal year 1985, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in S. Con. Res. 32.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC., September 9, 1985.  
HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays and estimated revenues in comparison with the appropriate levels for those items contained in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the 1985 budget (S. Con. Res. 32). This report for fiscal year 1985 is tabulated as of close of business September 5, 1985, and is based on assumptions and estimates consistent with S. Con. Res. 32. A summary of this tabulation is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]			
	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Current level.....	1,062,100	946,300	736,500
1985 budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 32.....	1,062,100	946,300	736,500
Current level is:			
Over resolution by.....			
Under resolution by.....			

Since my last report the Congress has adopted S. Con. Res. 32 revising the 1985 budget and cleared the Supplemental Appropriation, 1985, P.L. 99-88, and the State Department authorization, P.L. 99-93.

With best wishes,  
Sincerely,

ERIC HANUSHEK,  
(For Rudolph G. Penner).

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT—HOUSE SUPPORTING  
DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1985 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS  
SEPT. 5, 1985

[In millions of dollars]			
	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
I. Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues.....			736,650
Permanent appropriations and trust funds.....	686,201	607,817	
Other appropriations.....	542,981	516,642	
Offsetting receipts.....	-182,025	-182,025	
Total enacted in previous sessions.....	1,047,157	942,435	736,650
II. Enacted this session:			
Famine relief and recovery in Africa (Public Law 99-10).....	784	289	
Appropriations for the MX missile (Public Law 99-18).....		79	
Agricultural supplemental appropriation (Public Law 99-71).....	1,000		
Federal supplemental compensation phaseout (Public Law 99-15).....	160	160	
Statue of Liberty—Ellis Island Coin Act (Public Law 99-61).....	18	16	
Contemporaneous recordkeeping repeal bill (Public Law 99-44).....			-150
United States-Israel Free Trade Act (Public Law 99-47).....			(1)
State Department authorization (Public Law 99-83).....			-1
Supplemental appropriations bill (Public Law 99-88).....	(13,029)	(3,369)	

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT—HOUSE SUPPORTING  
DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1985 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS  
SEPT. 5, 1985—Continued

[In millions of dollars]			
	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Offsetting receipts.....	(-48)	(-48)	
Bill total.....	12,981	3,321	
Total enacted this session.....	14,943	3,865	-151
III. Continuing resolution authority.....			
IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses.....			
V. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action.....			
Total current level as of Sept. 5, 1985.....	1,062,100	946,300	736,500
1985 budget resolution (S. Con. Res. 32).....	1,062,100	946,300	736,500
Current level is:			
Over budget resolution.....			
Under budget resolution.....			

<sup>1</sup> Less than \$500,000.

Note.—Numbers may not add due to rounding.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I have taken up this special order tonight to talk about an issue that is on the minds of nearly every American, but that few in this House or in the other body choose to talk very loudly about, and that is the question of the budget. But more importantly, that is the question of a constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget and limit taxes.

This is an issue that has been talked about at great length by a variety of people for the last 7 to 8 years. Movements have been going on in the States across the Nation to encourage our Congress to respond accordingly. Now some 32 States have petitioned the Congress for the purpose of asking them to issue forth an amendment to balance the Federal budget, and yet Congress has failed to respond.

It was with this concern in mind, and with the conviction that I have developed over the last several years while serving in this body that, in fact, the Congress itself and this House included cannot control its spending habits, that spending has in itself become an institutionalized process, and that we no longer control or have the will, most importantly the fiscal responsibility to respond. So we have watched in a progressive way over the last 5 to 6 years a deficit grow from some \$40 billion to today's \$200 billion. We watched our Budget Committee's struggle this year in an attempt to reduce that \$200 billion down to around \$170 billion, and in all reality, they failed.

Just before the August recess, we saw the budget resolution come out

with some 68 billion dollars' worth of reconciliation in it. We see the pressures building here now and saw the action on the floor today that demonstrates that this body, although it might wish to choose the rhetoric and demonstrate to the American people that it is interested in reducing deficits, it really does not have the will. It does not have the will because the structure and the nature of this body, and the body across the way will not allow the kind of fiscal integrity and responsibility that well over 80 percent of the American public now demand.

With those concerns in mind, and with my belief in it, and the belief of a lot of other people in this House that the only way we begin to control the deficit was to control or change the structure by which we formulate the budget itself, I and others became convinced that the only avenue for doing so was to begin to push progressively for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget and limit taxes.

With that in mind, some 1½ years ago, I created the organization called CLUBB. [Constitutional Leaders United for a Balanced Budget]. And today, well over 120 Members, Republican and Democrat alike, have joined with me, both in the House and in the other body to move this issue. Now we have in this body House Joint Resolution 27 which is the constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget and limit taxes. As of today, 193 Members, Democrat and Republican alike, have joined in cosponsorship of that legislation.

The other body has crafted an amendment that has now left the Judiciary Committee, and we would anticipate votes on that constitutional amendment proposal in the other body in late September or early October.

Why are we seeing the renewed momentum on this issue? I think it is very simple. It is simple to understand because the American people have said so loudly and clearly "Get your fiscal house in order." We can no longer tolerate a \$200 billion deficit, nor can we tolerate that which a \$200 billion spawns, and now nearly \$150 billion in trade deficit, and an activity that is in place that is deindustrializing this Nation at a more rapid rate than ever in the history of this country.

I have said on numerous occasions in the last minute that this is a bipartisan issue. It is not Democrat, it is not Republican. It is American, because the American people are crying out for fiscal responsibility.

So I would now ask the cochairman of CLUBB, who has worked closely with me to build this coalition here in the House, who is the primary cosponsor of the House joint resolution, the gentleman from Texas, CHARLIE STENHOLM, to join with me in his comments

for a few minutes before we ask our other colleagues to participate with us.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank my colleague from Idaho for yielding this time, and I want to commend him for the leadership that he has shown in the organization of our CLUBB, our Congressional Leaders United for a Balanced Budget, that has been not only an attempt to focus attention nationwide and in other States, but actually doing it, of getting us to a position in which we have the wherewithal to focus attention in those key States if we in the Congress are unwilling to deal the balanced budget issue. We do have 32 States who have said that is what we want done.

□ 1830

Two more and the Constitution takes over where the lack of will in Congress has been. Without the leadership of the gentleman, Mr. CRAIG, we would not be there. I am proud to be associated with the gentleman from Idaho and the other Members in focusing on this very important question. It seems that everybody is for a balanced budget. We are beginning to hear it talked about by almost every Member of this body. The unfortunate thing to date is, we still just talk about it. There are some who are going to suggest now that because we are about to do this, or we have done this, or we have made a good faith step in the right direction with the budget this year that no longer is it going to be important to focus on the Constitution. Nothing could be further from the truth. I think at this very moment it is imperative in this body that we move steadily toward an actual vote and implementation of the constitutional amendment in order to back up whatever it is that we might be actually about to do in the area of spending in this body, proceeding towards a balanced budget.

I guess I would conclude my remarks at this moment by sharing again a little statement that was made 10 years after our Constitution was written by Mr. Thomas Jefferson. He said at that time:

I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution, I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government to the genuine principles of the Constitution. I mean an additional article taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing.

Oh, how we might wish some day in the near future that we had not borrowed the \$2 trillion we have borrowed in order to sustain a standard of living we have been unwilling to pay for in our generation.

Those words of Thomas Jefferson, I think, are going to ring in these Halls some day in the future, I hope in an orderly process as suggested by the gentleman.

Again, I commend the gentleman for his leadership and look forward to working with him and our other colleagues in a bipartisan way to put a little bit of deeds to our words concerning our concern about the deficit.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the gentleman, my colleague from Texas, for the leadership he has taken on this particular issue. There is no question that without him he would not have the number of cosponsors that we have today on House Joint Resolution 27; nor would we have the number of Members we have in CLUBB.

The gentleman has worked with me in stressing the bipartisan approach. We have accomplished that because, as I said earlier and certainly Congressman STENHOLM has said, this is an American issue; it is not a Republican issue nor is it a Democratic issue.

With a \$2 trillion national debt and well over 110 billion dollars' worth of financing needs in the 1986 budget just to finance that debt, we are indebteding generations and generations in front of us to an obligation to pay for the kind of living style we wish to live but that we are unwilling to pay for.

I would next like to ask my colleague from Oregon, BOB SMITH, who has taken a leadership role on this issue, who started early on when he first came to this Congress to jump into the issue of a balanced budget and to carry it forth to work with a variety of groups across this country, to begin to build that growing interest which now exists in America, to achieve a constitutional amendment, to balance the budget and limit taxes.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Idaho.

I thank the gentleman for taking this time because I think it is essential that this body and the other body of the Congress of the United States understand that the continuous spending habits which have prevailed in the past 40 years, really have come to significance in the last 10 years, are really the kinds of efforts that are destroying the economic future and opportunity for our country, for our families, and for our children of the future.

To bring us somewhat in light, I would want to share with the body and with my colleagues some numbers since I have been in the Congress, only. That has not been a very long time compared to many who are here.

But in 1982, I arrived and we had a tax increase in 1982. Some have forgotten that. It was called TEFRON, \$98 billion. In 1983 we had another tax increase, Social Security repair which cost \$165 billion. In 1984 we had another tax increase, so-called Tax Reform Act. That was another \$51 billion out of the taxpayers' pockets. In



that same year we also had a gas tax increase of \$5.5 billion.

Suddenly in 1985 we have the so-called Deficit Reduction Act which supposedly saved from \$38 billion to \$56 billion out of spending; but we know, those of us here, that that was smoke and mirrors, based upon faulty background, and we know that there was very little saving.

So what we have done, and what I am trying to point out, without saying so, we have raised taxes since 1982 in every year and our deficits continue to build.

The point of this is that the Congress, again, has not addressed the issue of spending and their spending habits.

To bring this to light, let me point out that in 1981, after only 209 years of our existence, our total national debt was \$997 billion; 4 years later, just 4 years later, it had doubled, and we will be facing the heartburn of the question of raising the debt ceiling to \$2 trillion before this year is out.

We have doubled the debt in this country in 4 years.

What is a greater problem is the question of the interest on the debt. The interest on the debt in 1981 was \$111 billion. The interest on the debt today in this budget we are facing is \$184 billion. Anybody in this business or anybody who has to face a budget knows that when you leverage a business or a household to the tune that you can no longer pay the interest on the debt, then you have sunk either the business or your household is out of business.

Therefore, I think that I have identified that the Congress has not controlled spending. Therefore, I believe there must be a systemic change. The change must be in the constitutional amendment to balance the budget which will become the 27th amendment to our Constitution.

We only amend our Constitution when it is absolutely essential. This becomes essential.

Let me say, I think it is safe to say there are only two categories of U.S. Representatives who serve in this House: The ones who know that their constituents want this amendment and the ones who have not yet asked.

The only alternative left is this balanced budget amendment, and I urge every Member of this body to either become a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 27 or if they are already a cosponsor to go get a colleague and join us because the fate of the Republic rests on his or her and our decision.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me this time.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank my colleague from Oregon for his leadership and his direct participation in this effort. He has been a stalwart in moving the issue with our colleagues here in the House. I think in your comments

today the gentleman brings up some obvious issues, at least in the minds of the American public.

I was told today that with a \$200 billion deficit, just this year's deficit, that we are talking about every man, woman, and child in this country being indebted another \$10,000. That is the kind of thing that is almost unbelievable: it certainly is to the average man and woman out there.

When you turn to a high school student and say, "How much do you owe the Federal Government?" well, they look at you and say, "Gee, I don't owe anything." If they earned a little money this last summer and qualified and paid their taxes, it was probably very minimal, they do not think they owe anything.

But in reality, with a \$2 trillion debt and the old line that, "Gee, whiz, national debt is no problem because you just owe it to yourself," the reality is we do owe it to ourselves. But now we are having to finance that national debt, and, in so doing, we have become a debtor nation for the first time in 70-some-odd years. Now, we are asking foreign governments and foreign interests to put money into our markets so we can afford to pay for the lifestyle that this Congress and this Government has decided they want to spend money on.

□ 1840

I think that is a very, very dangerous position for this country and the citizens of this country to allow our economy to get into, but we are now a debtor nation; and that debt rose progressively, and is held by foreign interests. Is that bad? Most certainly it is bad. It is bad because of what it generates ultimately, and that is a \$120 billion trade deficit, and that is an awful lot of people out of work, and no new jobs in the hard sectors of our country, and especially from the States that you and I come from in the West being created.

So let me thank you once again for being a participant, and being an absolute activist in this effort.

Now I would like to yield to my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO].

Mr. GALLO. I thank the gentleman from Idaho. I complement him for bringing this to the forefront. A lot of people have talked about this particular issue, and very few have done something about it.

I would like to relate an experience that I just had recently, going back to the district and talking about the many problems we think the citizens are interested in; and whether it be tax reform or whether it be the environment, came out loud and clear to me in a town meeting that I had, and numerous meetings with individuals throughout the 11th District in New Jersey, that the question most raised

and the most concerned, was dealing with a balanced budget.

They cannot understand; "they" meaning the people back home, why we cannot control the budget. They have to control that household budget, and they cannot understand, frankly, why we are sitting with such a large deficit, and apparently as you have indicated, not the will to control the spending habits.

So when I look, sometimes we here in Washington, being away from our constituents, have a little foggy view of what their concerns are; but I can tell you it is clearly the deficit as the number one priority.

Now it is interesting to note that when we look at our States, 48 States have a balanced budget requirement. The people I have talked to; some in the Congress, some outside the Congress, say, "DEAN, you are talking about a balanced budget. Do you know how much success you are going to have with that? It cannot work."

There is a defeatist attitude here that says you cannot balance the budget. In reality, when you look at the fact that 32 States have already signed on, petitioning Congress to have a constitutional convention, I think it proves that it is not a ridiculous matter; it is not something that States take in a frivolous fashion; it is something that we should stand up and start understanding is a large concern.

I have heard my colleagues mention the fact that we have the over \$200 billion deficit; we also have over right now a \$1.8 trillion national debt. As indicated, we are talking about every man, woman, and child owing \$10,000. Now that is a heck of a legacy and one that I do not want to be part of.

I think the job that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] and our colleague from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] in getting over 191 or now maybe 193 sponsors on this bill, I think suggests very strongly that there is a concern by this Congress, and all we need, frankly I would suggest, is maybe a few more of our colleagues that are just as concerned.

Those same colleagues that go back to the district and say, "Hey, we're concerned with this, and we want to see a balanced budget"; but they have not put their names on the line.

When we talk about balanced budget, the first question I get after that is, "How can we do that? How can we do that in a year?" I think it is pretty obvious to everyone that you are not going to do it in a year.

As it was explained and as we have discussed, it is something that is going to take a minimum of 4 and possibly 5 years, and it can be done with very little disruption; just a little bit of courage and a little bit of determination.

Mr. CRAIG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLO. I certainly will.

Mr. CRAIG. When the gentleman talks about a framework of 4 to 5 years to balance the Federal budget, one of the questions I oftentimes get in speaking on this issue across the country is: Congressman, do you really think you can balance the budget? Do you really think you can get rid of \$200 billion?

My answer is no. You cannot do that overnight; it could not be done next year; but what you are suggesting in a 4- to 5-year period is establishing a framework under which this Congress would operate to progressively reduce the deficit, knowing that out there at a 4- or 5-year period, they must bring it into balance. Is that what I understand of you?

Mr. GALLO. That is absolutely right. There is that concern, and I think it can be done. I know we have discussed it; some of my other colleagues have discussed that. It is a workable solution, and one that I think has a great deal of merit, and one that should be followed through on.

I know that when we talk about this year there are very few sessions that are going to be left; I think that it is imperative that all of us that are as concerned, and your organization do everything in its power to inform those Members that have not signed on to bring about a recognition by the House and the Speaker that this Congress is serious about having a constitutional amendment dealing with a balanced budget.

I know that those States, and right now it was mentioned by the gentleman from Texas, we have 32 States that have signed on. Constitutionally, to take this out of the Congress' hands, we need two more States.

It is my understanding that the State of Michigan is in deliberation on this particular issue, and hopefully they will vote in favor of it. Another State that may play a very important role is my own State of New Jersey. That State, I had before coming here, the opportunity as minority leader to introduce a balanced budget amendment requiring the Congress to act and as of yet, that has not taken place, but I know it is in the good hands of Senator Dorsey in the New Jersey Senate, and a number of House members.

I would hope that they would react positively to this, because I think as you go out more and more, this question is not going to fall on its face; you are not going to forget about it; you are going to hear more and more about it.

So in conclusion, I just want to compliment you and also our colleague from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], those members of that organization which I

am proud to be part of, as a member, in trying to bring the awareness level to the public and to this Congress.

People today do understand that deficits mean higher costs to them, not only in the possibility of inflation, but also in the real dollar sense as far as interest.

So to you I congratulate you, and I am pleased to be part of this particular debate and dialog, and I hope that it brings about a better understanding with our colleagues.

Mr. CRAIG. Let me thank my colleague from New Jersey who, coming to this body as a freshman, very quickly said, "I want to be a part of that issue, because I so strongly believe in it." As the gentleman has explained, he has been a leader in his State legislature on this issue in attempting to get the State of New Jersey to petition the Congress for the purpose of an amendment to balance the budget. There is no other issue, in my opinion.

When the gentleman talks of the kind of figures he mentions, that every man, woman, and child in this country based on a \$2 trillion national debt, now owes \$10,000, and that for every \$200 billion of deficit that is then moved into the debt column, that that adds \$1,000 of debt to each one of those individuals.

□ 1850

I think it is only a matter of time before the American public stand up and says, "Enough. We don't care what program it is, whose program it is, how that program affects me or my neighbor or my community, stop it, Congress, stop it, you have done too much, you have gone too far, and now you have consumed such a large portion of the gross national product of this country and you have committed another large portion of it on an annual basis."

We are not far away from seeing interest on the debt as a single line item in the Federal budget of being No. 2 in size. And, you know, it is interesting. We can sit here, and we do on a regular basis, and debate which program has merit and which program does not have merit and what we will cut here and what we will not cut here. But there is one item that has no debate, none whatsoever. The Budget Committee merely pencils it in, in cooperation with the Office of Management and Budget and the Treasury, and that is called interest on the debt. We cannot decide how much we will pay and when we will pay it. It must be paid. That is the only section of the Federal budget that commands no debate. When that becomes the single largest item or the second single largest item, it will buy no services, it will buy no goods, it will put food in no one's mouth, it will put no missiles in place to protect us. It will simply consume a monstrously large amount of

the gross national product of this country for the purpose of financing excess spending of periods past.

Now I would like to recognize another colleague of mine, another freshman who joined this effort and who has been a leader in the area of concern of a balanced budget, my colleague from Texas [Mr. BOULTER].

Mr. BOULTER. I thank my colleague for yielding. I just want to tell you how grateful I am to you, Congressman CRAIG, and also to my very good friend and distinguished colleague from Texas [CHARLIE STENHOLM], for your leadership on this issue, and especially for forming CLUBB [Congressional Leaders United for a Balanced Budget]. And I must say to you that there are two organizations in this body that I am particularly proud to be associated with, and one of them is CLUBB, the group within the House of Representatives that is actively working toward the constitutional amendment to balance the budget and limit taxes, and the other group is the Grace caucus, which I am proud to be the chairman of, because, I will tell you, I came to Congress for the first time this session, and even before being sworn in on January 3, I became a cosponsor of the constitutional amendment to balance the budget and limit taxes, and I did that because in my campaign I talked about and committed myself to doing something about controlling Federal spending.

I do believe, incidentally, that as horrendous as the deficit is, even if our budget were in balance, at this level of Federal spending we would still have a very, very severe problem, and the deficit is more a symptom of what is going on in this country than it is the problem.

But I will tell you how my people feel about it that I represent: They truly believe that the number one issue in our country today is not tax reform, though we need that, but it is the deficit and the threat that it poses to our children. And you have very adequately pointed out, Congressman CRAIG, some of the dangers and danger signs that we see right now. The \$150 million trade deficit, that is very much related to this fiscal deficit. The almost \$2 trillion national debt, what is the interest on that? Is it \$145 billion right now? Something like that. I can tell you that within this other group, the Grace caucus, we have done some calculations that at current levels of Federal spending, only 15 years hence, when my children will be entering the job market, we will have an annual debt not of \$2 trillion but of \$13 trillion by the year 2000. And what kind of a world will our kids live in if that happens? I do believe that their liberties, their freedoms are linked to their economic opportunities, and if



they are having to work the greater portion of every day just to pay the interest on the national debt, they do not have any economic opportunity and they will not have the liberty and the freedom that they enjoy today.

For my part, I have promised myself and the people I represent that I will never vote for any kind of tax increase until certain reforms are set in place, and one of those is the constitutional amendment to balance the budget, because I truly believe that increased revenues would just be used to further programs that we need to terminate.

I want to speak, for a moment, about my experience on the Budget Committee. It has been a terrific honor to serve on that committee, and also on the conference committee. But I can tell you that every special interest group in America came before our committee, all applauding our efforts to cut the deficit, but each and every one of them saying, "You have got to cut the deficit, but \*\*\*." And this deficit reduction package that we came up with, I supported, I felt like it was the responsible thing to do, but we all know it is no victory over deficits. At best, it is a truce. I feel like our efforts to cut the deficit really fell victim to the same thing that I fear tax reform is falling victim to, and that is special interest groups, to the detriment of families and children, and it is so important, it is the number one threat to our country today, this Federal spending. I just want to congratulate you and recommit myself to working with you and the other Members of CLUBB toward resolving this great crisis which we are in, which I think can only be done with the passage of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

Mr. CRAIG. Let me thank my colleague from Texas for those kind words and also to say very clearly you are a leader in this body, willing to stand up and speak out on those things you believe in and to take up issues that are as controversial here, not nationwide, but here, as the constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget and to limit taxes. I appreciate your leadership in this area. One of the things that was very pleasing this year, as we saw the freshman class come in, both sides, Democrat and Republican alike, great numbers joined this cause because they knew right upfront, early on—it did not take them long to learn—that the only way we were really going to change the habits of this body and especially those fiscal habits, those spending habits, those institutionalized ways that we pour money out, was to do something structurally different to change the system and to do that through a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. So I appreciate your leadership in that area.

I would now like to recognize my colleague from Pennsylvania, an outspoken critic on Federal spending, certainly a leader in this House as it relates to keeping what spending levels we have done as much as possible, taking tough stands and making the point hard for a good many people here because it is so important that we vote on these critical issues. I appreciate the leadership of my colleague, BOB WALKER, from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to take issue, for a moment, with a comment that my colleague from Texas made a minute ago. It is just a difference in degree or a difference in rhetoric to some extent, but I think it is an important difference. I think the major problem facing the country that the American people have recognized is a spending problem. I think that the deficit problem, we tend to talk around here about deficits, but the deficit is the symptom of the spending problem, and I know that that is what the gentleman was reflecting. But I am trying to make it clear to my constituents that there are some who talk deficits around here who want to talk deficits because their idea is to use taxes as a way to solve the deficit problem.

Well, that is not the real problem. The problem is a spending problem, which is precisely what the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution speaks to. It says that it is time that we discipline ourselves on spending. And that is absolutely essential for the future of this country. It seems to me that our colleague from Oregon, when he talked about the fact that the survival of the Republic depends on us finding a way to discipline ourselves on spending, has related the issue, because it is the issue. We cannot go on much longer adding \$1,000 a year to every family's personal debt and to the personal debt of every man, woman, and child because of what we spend and have this Nation survive economically. And if it does not survive economically, it cannot survive in any other way. So we really are at a moment of national crisis that needs a solution.

The balanced budget amendment to the Constitution is not a perfect tool but it is a useful tool, and it is in fact the kind of disciplinary tool that will allow us to address this problem in a meaningful way. I think we ought to recognize why it is that we need to do so. And nobody has pointed out that more clearly than the gentleman from Idaho here this evening when he has mentioned the fact that \$200 billion worth of deficit this year means adding \$1,000 to each family's personal debt.

We have a hard time visualizing \$200 billion. We have a hard time visualizing \$2 trillion. But \$1,000 of additional

debt in a year is something that most families can visualize, and most average families—maybe too many people in this Congress are too far away from most average families—but most average families think long and hard before they incur an additional \$1,000 in debt. And yet day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year, we pile that debt onto them, we spend the money for them, and often it is done without very much thought.

□ 1900

Mr. CRAIG. You are talking about the newborn baby, at this minute. We are not talking about adults only, are we?

Mr. WALKER. The baby that just this second came screaming into the world as an American has a thousand dollars of debt on his head as a result of what we are piling up in deficits. If you take a look at the \$2 trillion, he has \$10,000 in overall debt, and I think we ought to look at that, too, because most average American families in this country incur \$10,000 worth of debt for only a couple of things. One is to buy a house, most average families incur that much debt, and to buy a new car most families incur that much debt. But we have incurred it for them right here at the Federal level. We have said we are going to pile \$10,000 worth of debt onto you and you are going to pay for it. The fact is that they pay for it just as assuredly here as if they had incurred it themselves. They pay for it with the higher interest rates; they pay for it with higher costs in the society as a whole when that kind of debt becomes inflationary. They pay for it. They pay for it over and over and over again. Yet, they do not make that decision. It would be a very tough decision for them to make as a family. Families think long and hard in this country before they buy a home or buy a new car because it is so much debt. Yet, Congress does it day after day.

We did it today. We could not cut our spending habits today to save \$22 million on something like Amtrak. We cannot do it at all. We need discipline. The only disciplinary tool that has any chance at all of being effective is the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The gentleman from Idaho has provided us with some real leadership toward getting us to the day when this House might actually have the guts to vote on it. That is the problem. We lack the guts to vote on it around here. So we might actually get the guts to vote on it because of the leadership shown by the gentleman from Idaho. I congratulate him for his work and for taking this special order.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his comments and for the leadership role he has

taken on the issue of fiscal responsibility.

I yield to my colleague from Texas. Mr. BOULTER. I thank the gentleman.

In response to my colleague from Pennsylvania I think you are exactly right. What I said was that the deficit is the symptom. I think the greatest need in our country today is for some capital. That is exactly why Japan is beating us so badly right now and why we have a \$150 billion trade deficit right now.

The real problem is the ever-increasing level of Federal spending, and as you so eloquently point out, just the sheer lack of courage by the Members of this body to say "no." As a result, with this kind of Federal spending which the deficit reflects, we have a crowding out of private sector initiative at every level, whether it is capital formation or volunteer work or helping our neighbors. The Government seems to be trying to do everything for everybody and there is less incentive for me as an individual to do it. There is less opportunity to get our hands on the capital. It is killing our farmers our small businessmen and everybody knows that. You are exactly correct.

I know one thing, it would make it easier for me, I do not think any of us is immune from the pressure to spend, and it would make it so much easier to say "no" if there were this constitutional prohibition against overspending.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I do not know of any constituency for the Federal deficit. Everybody is against the Federal deficit, yet we have one and we have one year after year. I understand what the gentleman is saying with respect to a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. In fact, I came here thinking that is probably the wrong thing to do, and after hanging around several years I decided it is probably something we ought to do.

I do not necessarily support the same constitutional amendment that the President supports for a number of very important reasons, but I think the kind of language that Thomas Jefferson suggested in the original debate about this would probably make some sense in the Constitution.

It is important to understand that you can change the Constitution, but that does not mean that you balance the budget. The only way the budget gets balanced is one, if the President recommends a balanced budget and two, if Congress adopts one. If we change the Constitution tomorrow, there would be a President, Republican or Democrat, and a Congress, Re-

publican or Democrat who would say, "Let us have a capital budget and an operating budget. Let us do it that way."

The point I am trying to make is this: We have a shared responsibility between a President who recommends big budget deficits and a Congress that follows his lead. We have got to solve the problem. We do not have the luxury of avoiding it any longer. Changing the Constitution, which I think is something we ought to do but do in the right way, will not solve the problem. The President and Congress will solve the problem by reconciling that which they want to spend with the revenues they are willing to bring in. I might say after attending meetings in my district, people say, well, how do you solve this thing? I scratch my head and say, well, it is very difficult at the moment because the biggest part of the current budget some say has to be increased. Notably defense. We must have some kind of increase in the largest portion of the budget. On the revenue side of the budget, we prohibit any sort of additional revenue. With that kind of mathematical equation, you cannot resolve the issue. I say that when you stand in the well and talk about the deficit you are talking about the issue that a lot of Americans are concerned about. All of us, from both parties, need to do what we must, what we can to try and move this fiscal policy of this country to some sort of stability moving towards a balanced budget.

I am with you; I am simply here today that ultimately a person, a President, a Congressman, a Republican and a Democrat must vote in the right way to balance the budget as between revenues and spending. That is ultimately the way you get that done.

Mr. CRAIG. Let me thank my colleague for making those statements and I am certainly the first to admit that House Joint Resolution 27 may not be the perfect document, and I would encourage my colleague to come join with us in the activity and the debate and support getting the issue out to the floor of this Congress so that we can show the American people that we are really sincere. That we are sincere in changing the Constitution to put into it the tool, not the absolute corrective measure, but the tool that will force us, not allow us, but force us to be fiscally responsible. You and I have both served here long enough to know that we can find any excuse in the book and probably do pretty good at home selling it to our constituents as to why we ought to spend money. The bottom line is we are spending a great deal more than we are willing to take in. In so doing that, we are creating a major fiscal problem in this country.

Now, we are willing to spend \$100, but we are only willing to take in

about \$80. The question is can we take in the other \$20 and allow the economy, your farmers and my farmers, to exist? Is there going to be enough money out there for them to borrow their operating lines and to be able to conduct their business? If Government really took all that it is now spending, or is spending really the issue? I think it is, and I think my colleague concurs with me in that. But join with us, come with us in creating the tool. More importantly, providing the avenue and the opportunity here on the floor of the House in which we can create that tool, the constitutional amendment to force this body and the other body to, for the first time in a great long while, to be fiscally responsible. I thank my colleague for joining with us this evening on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield to my colleague from Texas, Congressman ARMEY, who, once again, is one of those freshmen who came here and joined early on in this issue, recognizing the problems we have with the deficit and the debt. He joined the balanced budget effort, became a member of CLUBB, is a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 27, and has been an outspoken leader in his freshman group and here in the Congress on the question of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by pointing out how much I appreciate the gentleman from Idaho taking this as well as the other work you have done. I do have some prepared comments and Mr. Speaker, I would ask that they be placed in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just focus very quickly on a few issues because we have some other people who want to speak. I embrace, endorse and work for the balanced budget amendment with a certain reservation. That reservation being that it ought not to be necessary. The basic fact is we have a Congress that for too many years, too many sessions, time after time in each new session of Congress, we have a Congress that gets out of hand and they let spending get out of hand. They have not had a sense of discipline and I have become convinced that they may not get a sense of discipline and restraint in spending.

□ 1910

The American people have said, and I think are saying to us daily, "Enough is enough. You have got to hold the line on spending. If you cannot get the discipline on a basis of appropriation bill by appropriation bill, then find the discipline in the budgetary process and begin with a balanced budget amendment or rule, and if you will not adopt a balanced budget amendment



for yourselves to obtain that discipline, we will force its adoption through the States." And we are very close to the American people succeeding in forcing this adoption in that manner.

I think it is time that we stand up at this point and say to the American people, "We hear you. We respect you. We do not want you to have to send your message through the State legislatures. We are ready to respond. We are ready to pass this amendment, obtain the rule, learn the discipline, practice the restraint and quit spending your money."

As a final observation, that young baby that is born in America today with \$10,000 worth of debt is going to have \$28,000 worth of debt by the time he or she is 18 years old and beginning to earn a living. Can you imagine going to your first job already \$28,000 in debt, a sum considerably less than you are likely to earn for some years to come?

As a freshman Member of Congress, perhaps I am better able to recall the frustration and bewilderment with which the average American views \$200 billion annual deficits and a \$2-trillion national debt. Our constituents hear a lot about fiscal responsibility and budget cutting, yet these tremendous deficits persist and our national indebtedness continues to grow. Indeed, it was Congress' inability to act in a constitutional and fiscally responsible manner which motivated me to seek this office.

Committed as I am to fiscal responsibility, one of the first things I did as a Member of Congress was to cosponsor House Joint Resolution 27, the balanced budget/tax limitation amendment. I was also pleased to join with a number of other concerned colleagues in Congressional Leaders United For A Balanced Budget, a group dedicated to passage of a balanced budget/tax limitation amendment. This measure is not an end unto itself; it will, however, force Congress to begin to exercise the fiscal responsibility which the people demand.

By requiring a balanced budget, except in emergencies, it would force the Congress to live within its means—something which every individual must do, and something which Congress has put off for too long.

I also think it is important to stress the "tax limitation" aspect of House Joint Resolution 27. The answer to our budget crisis does not lie in tax increases. We've tried this route before and the long and the short of this act is that it doesn't work. A spendthrift Congress continues to spend what we take from the American people in taxes, and spends more, and more, and more.

Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a number of difficult spending decisions daily. But let me remind my colleagues that we asked the people for this job and we have a responsibility not only to them, but to future generations of Americans, to put our fiscal house in order. The longer we postpone the

day of reckoning, the more painful it will be.

Mr. CRAIG. I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, for those valuable words and those observations. He has been strong and outspoken on this issue, and we appreciate his leadership here in the House for fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DENNY SMITH] who I came to this Congress with back in 1981, who in a very short time recognized that the only way we were going to control our spending habits was to do something which is rather fair and equitable but that was very strong in its effort, and that was to freeze the Federal budget. I believe he started that idea some 3 years ago, and if we had followed his leadership at that time, we would not be struggling with a \$200-billion deficit today.

But not only did he lead in that area of fiscal responsibility, he early on recognized the need for the tool, as our colleague from Pennsylvania said, the tool of a constitutional amendment to force this Congress to balance the budget, and became a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 27 and a member of the CLUBB organization.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DENNY SMITH].

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just cannot tell you how much thought goes into the past here, the past 5 years, and I have to thank the gentleman and the people of western Idaho who have sent him here and the opportunity to help provide that tool to the citizens and the taxpayers in this country.

I remember when we were campaigning 5 years ago as citizens of this country, the gentleman from Idaho and I in the western Oregon area, and 1980 is just a short period ago. When we got to the Congress in 1981, we were faced with one of the tough votes in early 1981 that I think those of us who came here to balance the budget had to face, and that was whether we were going to raise the national debt ceiling at that time to exceed the \$1 trillion mark for the first time. I believe it was \$980 billion at the time. I am proud to say that I voted against that, and I think that was a very good vote at that time. I still am proud of having done that, and especially when we look back on the fact that since 1981 the spending in the budget of this Congress and in these United States has gone from \$660 billion a year to \$1 trillion.

So I am proud to join with my colleague tonight in trying to bring more attention to the need to have a tool that will help us balance this budget.

When I travel around Oregon and around this country, too, people say to me, "Can we really balance the

budget? Is it really possible for us to balance the budget?"

Then I will tell them, "Sure it is. You have to balance your budget. The State has to balance its budget. All the companies in this country have to balance their budgets."

Yet we cannot seem to balance the budget here. I had a telephone conversation about a week ago with one of my constituents, and he said, "Say, I have kind of a simple idea. Why do we not just cut 10 percent out of everything in this entire budget and get to a balanced budget?"

I said, "Well, I can go you one better than that. We can just freeze the budget. We can just start this process." And yet the media have talked a great deal about the fact that we have a \$58-billion budget deficit cut. We did not cut anything. Having served on the Budget Committee for these last 9 months, I can say that the budget process is really dead. It is dead without that tool that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] and those Members who have been here and have been talking about it this evening need, along with the rest of the Members in this body.

If we are going to have the ability and the courage to really straighten out the fiscal morass that the finances of the United States is in, we have got to have the balanced budget amendment.

The leadership of the gentleman from Idaho, and the Congressional Leaders United For a Balanced Budget has just been crucial. If we can get those other 2 States and force this constitutional convention, we will force the leadership in this body, this House of Representatives of the people of the United States, to act and bring forward on this floor the opportunity to debate and to get into the Constitution of the United States an opportunity for all of us in this body and all citizens to enjoy the balanced budget and what that would bring to us, which is financial sanity and a fiscal opportunity to straighten out the finances of this Nation and of the entire world.

So I congratulate my colleague, and I appreciate his taking this special order. I am glad to help him at any time in the future and stand ready and able and willing to vote with him.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank my colleague from Oregon for those statements, those kind words, and most assuredly his leadership in these areas. He has not only been a bulldog on the issue; he has been a watchdog in calling attention to the activities and the spending habits of this Congress when they clearly deserve to be called to the attention of the American people.

I just wish we had had the wisdom 3 years ago to follow his leadership in suggesting that then was the time to

freeze the budget. I am convinced if we had done that then, we would not only be a long way toward bringing ourselves toward a balanced budget, but we would see the kind of economic resurgence in this country that would probably have unemployment down a couple of more points than it is now, and interest rates would be down a couple more points, and we would not be staggering under the weight of the deluge of products from all over the world as we become the world's warehouse of goods instead of the world's manufacturer of goods.

So I thank my colleague for his leadership, his wisdom, and especially his effort on the issue of the constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE], once again a freshman in this body, who has been a leader on the issue not only here but in his own State early on when he came and joined the CLUBB organization, became a cosponsor of the balanced budget resolution, and has certainly served here for his constituents in North Carolina as a leader for fiscal responsibility.

Mr. COBLE. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Idaho, and the gentleman from Texas who cosponsored this proposal with him. It is a long time coming and needs to be passed very imminently.

As the gentleman just implied, in 1979, as a sitting member of the North Carolina House of Representatives, I was one of the cosponsors of the resolution that urged the Congress to indeed adopt a balanced budget amendment. That was 6 years ago, before the balanced budget amendment revolution was in full force. I knew then it needed to be done. It needed to be done, it seemed to me, and I do not mean this critically, because the Members of this body simply lacked the discipline to do it voluntarily, and I believe if this bill is passed, I think it will not be a voluntary effort.

□ 1920

It will be a direction that has been given, and we will have no choice but to adhere to it.

I am an enthusiastic cosponsor of the gentleman's proposal. I hope that our other Members share the optimism the gentleman and I have concerning the fate of this legislation.

Let me say to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] that I said some months ago to my colleagues on the floor, "When we come on the floor, you know, we must insert our respective cards into our voting machine, and that activates the machine." I said to some of my friends on the floor, "Sometime when your machine is activated, press the no button. We have a no button on our machines."

I do not mean this to sound negatively, but many Members on this floor are incapable of hitting the no button. The no button works. Try it, you might like it. I do not like to be "Congressman No," but that no button works, and until we are willing and disciplined to activate it, we are whistling in the dark. Join me in voting no occasionally when no is the right vote, and join me in supporting the gentleman from Idaho and our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, who cosponsors this with him, and let us get this bill rolling.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for having yielded to me.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, for the good sense he makes in his statement and in his support of the constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget.

I find it so interesting, as I have the opportunity to speak in my district, across my State, and in other areas of the country, that the American people ask the simple question: "Why not? Why can't you do it? If you don't do it, what will ultimately happen to our country?"

What happens when the \$2-trillion national debt becomes \$3, and then \$4, and then \$5, and then it takes \$200 billion to finance it on a regular basis? Do you simply walk away from the debt? Do you default? Do you say to those who bought the bonds of this country, who borrowed, or loaned the money to this country to operate, that we are going to walk away from our debt?

No, we cannot do that as a nation. We cannot invite world financial collapse by our fiscal irresponsibility. The American people understand that, but for some reason this body does not.

As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] knows, we struggle and we argue, and we find some good reason to support the budget that we support. We have 435 Members in this House, and there are hundreds of special-interest groups who will tell us privately in our offices that they agree with us that we have got to cut the spending, that we have got to bring the budget under control, but they ask, in their particular area, would we please fund them at an adequate level because theirs is unique and theirs is special?

That is, of course, one of the reasons why this body can no longer say no, because all of us have at least one special-interest group we find it pretty difficult to say no to, and then collectively we find it very difficult to say no to all of them. That has resulted in record deficits, and a record debt, and an economy that is now struggling to try to come alive and provide the sustenance and vitality that the men, and

women, and young people in this country are asking for so they may have an opportunity and a job.

The constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget and limit taxes is not absolute, as has been said by many of our colleagues here this evening, but it is a valuable tool in guiding and directing the Congress of the United States toward fiscal responsibility and providing the ultimate test by which their constituent can then judge them to see if they really do in Congress what they say they would like to do while they are back in their districts.

I thank my colleagues for joining with me in this special order tonight, and I urge my colleagues here in the House who are not now sponsors of House Joint Resolution 27 to join with us in this most critical issue at a most important time in our history.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### THE ISSUE OF DUTY-FREE ETHANOL IMPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days within which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order, and I also ask unanimous consent for permission to insert, during the course of my statement, certain written documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order tonight relative to an issue that is very important to the Midwest and certainly one which is important to our Nation's economy and to the deficit which has been spoken to this evening by many Members.

The issue is relative to a decision made by the Department of the Treasury on August 26 relating to the import of Brazilian blended ethanol. This decision by our Treasury Department, as we will explain during the course of this special order, will have a significant negative impact on American farmers and farm families, on American workers, on the American Treasury, and ultimately on the security of our Nation as it relates to our energy independence.

I am glad to be joined in this effort relating to this issue by my colleagues: first, by the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman JIM LEACH; the gentleman from North Dakota, Congressman BYRON DORGAN; and the gentleman from South Dakota, Congress-



man TOM DASCHLE. Prior to making my remarks, I would like to yield to my three colleagues who have stayed with me this evening. First, I yield to my colleague from the other side of the aisle who has joined me from the beginning in this effort, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], for the purpose of a statement.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to stress, as, I think, all Members of the House understand, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has led this issue of ethanol more than any other Member of the House and has in fact stood up for the interests of farmers on many issues as profoundly as any Member I know.

I would just like to make three brief observations this evening. One relates to the farm economy. We all understand that it is in difficulty. We also understand that one of the ways we deal with the issue is to seek out new markets for products. Ethanol has as much potential in the great Corn Belt as any other product.

I will be introducing certain legislation tomorrow which will be designed to establish a strategic ethanol reserve which will in effect have the same balance as the strategic petroleum reserve. In theory, however, it will be a reserve based on products that are grown in America, as contrasted to the strategic petroleum reserve, which is based on products which are produced abroad and which also are depletable.

The second point I would like to make relates to the fact that as we look at the whole issue of the farm economy, there are a lot of reasons for the problem. One is the mix of fiscal and monetary policy that has given us a highly valued dollar and high interest rates. In that mix, we in the Congress bear a good deal of responsibility, as does the Federal Reserve Board for administering a rather taut monetary policy for the last 4 or 5 years.

But with regard to the ethanol issue, there is a third aspect that relates to an administration that is of a classic State Department variety. I happen to believe that we have one of the most professional and competent State Departments in the world, but it is a State Department that is politically attuned and not economically attuned. It is a State Department that does not stand up for American economic interests in the same way and with the same degree of professionalism that it stands up for American political interests.

What we have in the ethanol issue is the advocacy of the U.S. Ambassador to Brazil on behalf of the Brazilian Government, in fact, in this case a Brazilian petroleum company that is state-owned and which has under its jurisdiction a strategic ethanol reserve and which also desires to sell ethanol in the United States of America. The

American Ambassador requested over 1 year ago of the U.S. Government that we bend the law of the United States to allow ethanol to be imported from Brazil to America without certain tariff restrictions that existed. The American Ambassador also, in a communication formally to our Government, asked that our Government supply him a resident expert on tariff laws that would be able to advise the Brazilian Government on how to get around the tariff laws of the United States.

The arrogance of that request, coupled with the lack of judgment involved with trying to bend the law of the United States in such a way that the American economy is jeopardized, I think, underscores a problem with the U.S. State Department that ought to be well understood by this body. I will say that the Ambassador at issue—and I think it is important to understand this—is a professional career diplomat of distinguished record, excellent stature, and qualifications, and so as I view it, what is at stake is a bias and orientation within the Department of State, and this Congress has a responsibility to shed light on what is happening with Brazilian imports into this country.

□ 1930

Then, finally, let me just conclude by noting that if we think that something is rotten in the state of Denmark, as Shakespeare used to say, or rotten in the State of Washington, as is being reflected on issues of this nature, nothing reflects more on the lack of priorities in this country than the fact that the greatest agricultural country in the history of the world is today importing in the Farm Belt itself, oats from Sweden, hogs from Canada, and now the equivalent of corn or corn substitutes from Brazil right into the heartland. This can imply only one thing: that something systemically is wrong with Government, because the system we have of American agriculture is unrivaled in the world.

So somehow we have to start with a Washington perspective to serve the farmer as the farmer has served America.

With that as a basic orientation, let me suggest that the special order of the gentleman from Illinois is very well taken and I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on the issue.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

At this point I would like to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE].

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I, too, want to commend him. No one in the House has taken this issue on with more determination or with more leadership than has the gentleman

from Illinois. We all owe him a debt of gratitude for his persistence in pursuing this issue as doggedly as he has over the last several months.

I think we need to talk a little bit about why we are here.

Today's special order is an opportunity for those of us who have fought long and hard for development of a viable domestic fuel ethanol industry to turn the spotlight once again on what I perceive to be a very ill-advised administration decision which clearly stifles this important industry's tremendous potential. We are talking here about the August 26 Customs Service ruling which exempts certain marketers and traders from a congressionally mandated 60-cent duty on blended ethanol imports.

The United States has a growing ethanol industry. We know that. It is well documented. Over the past several years it has been competitive with foreign-government subsidized imported ethanol, largely due to a 60 cents per gallon import duty imposed by Congress in 1980. However, certain marketers and traders have increasingly sought to circumvent that duty, and I think the gentleman is going to be addressing that issue in much more depth at a later time.

Earlier this year, the U.S. Customs Service issued several letter rulings permitting Brazilian-made ethanol blended with the additive toluene to enter the United States duty free. Under pressure from farm-State Members of Congress, the Customs Service announced on August 2 that it would revoke the rulings and reinstitute the 60-cent duty on toluene-blended ethanol. It appeared the problem was solved until the Treasury Department issued a further ruling on August 26 which permits certain shipments of blended ethanol to enter the United States without the duty until November 1.

Well, that is the story so far.

This latest administration ruling places both the U.S. ethanol industry and American farmers in serious jeopardy, I might add at a very vulnerable time. It could allow up to 500 million gallons of imported ethanol to enter the country duty free. Nothing could be a more significant blow to our prospects of succeeding.

These imports are going to undercut the long-term potential of the industry and provide a short-term blow to the farm community at a time when the country faces a serious problem of agricultural surpluses.

Consider the costs of this decision: 200 million bushels of corn will not be converted into ethanol in the United States, in a year when the United States has a bumper crop of corn; a 200-million bushel surplus could drive down the price of corn 15 cents a bushel, according to the National Corn

Growers; and \$1.2 billion in farm income will be lost if those 200 million bushels are not converted into ethanol.

Most significant in terms of the deficit, the U.S. Treasury could lose up to \$300 million if otherwise would have collected in import duties on the foreign-made ethanol.

As the cofounder of the congressional alcohol fuels caucus, I have been involved in the private sector/government partnership that has been so successful so far in building a substantial fuel ethanol industry in a relatively short period of time. Today, private sector investment of over \$1 billion has built an industry that will process nearly 250 million bushels of corn—roughly the equivalent of our exports to the Soviet Union—into nearly 600 million gallons of ethanol. Moreover, in addition to providing a critically needed outlet for our productive farmers' grains, this industry is also producing the most environmentally acceptable alternative to lead as an octane enhancer in gasoline.

The Customs Service August 26 ruling places narrow special interests over the broader national interest in violation of the intent of Congress and without benefit of meaningful congressional review. Congress should not allow the administration to run roughshod over farmers and ethanol producers in order to benefit a few marketers and traders who stand to make substantial profits.

We must be committed to seeing this ill-conceived Customs Service decision reversed. A number of Members have already urged Treasury Secretary Baker under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois to reverse the Customs Service's August 26 ruling and require the collection of import duty for all ethanol/toluene blend. I hope additional Members will join this effort and raise similar concerns with the Secretary.

In addition, I believe that we must look beyond this immediate challenge to the domestic fuel ethanol industry and take greater initiative implementing policies which will expand—not impede—the growth of the domestic ethanol industry. It is imperative that we succeed in the campaign we have begun to make the farmer not only a food, feed, and fiber producer, but also an energy producer.

Attainment of the National Corn Growers' goal of 1 billion bushels of corn into ethanol by 1990 is feasible, and we must take the innovative steps needed to insure that the industry's market opportunities are met. The EPA's decision to reduce lead in gasoline has created an incredible potential of an alcohol equivalent octane gap of 60 billion gallons over the next decade. It should be our objective to have every gallon of that gap filled by agriculturally derived, renewable etha-

nol. Hopefully, administration officials will learn from their mistakes in the toluene import incident and work with Congress to provide the meaningful short-term incentives which the domestic fuel ethanol industry needs to realize its full potential.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank my colleague from South Dakota who is also a member of the Agriculture Committee for his leadership on this issue and for his cooperation through the alcohol fuels caucus and the promotion of alcohol fuels over the years.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], a member of the Ways and Means Committee who has joined us in this effort.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I want to thank Congressman DURBIN for this special order and the opportunity to speak on it.

I have felt for a long while that the ethanol industry is an industry of the future for the midwestern part of this country, the so-called Farm Belt. It seems to me that a country with energy problems and the need to move toward energy independence is a country that ought to look to a vast resource, notably kernels of corn that we grow in great abundance, barley, wheat and other agricultural products, as a source of energy. To take a kernel of corn and extract from that kernel the alcohol content, you still have left after you have achieved the alcohol, you still have left a protein feed stock; so using our vast agricultural surplus to extend our energy supplies makes good sense to me.

I would have preferred, for example, when we built this program called the PIC Program down at the Department of Agriculture that we would have instead built a network of ethanol alcohol plants across the Midwest that would be there for many, many years, using surplus agricultural products to extend our energy supplies in this country through the use of ethanol alcohol; but that was not the case. That was not done, and I think to the detriment of our agricultural community.

We are developing an ethanol industry in this country. We are doing it slowly. We would like to see much more rapid progress than currently exists, but still that industry is developing, with the help of Congress in many different ways. It will be in my judgment the industry of the future in the Farm Belt.

At the moment there are several threats. One is the loss of the tax exemption that exists, the 6-cent exemption that exists for ethanol.

The President says, "Let's get rid of that." Well that is going to be phased out in 1992 under present law. Plans have been made, facilities have been constructed based on that notion that we will phase out that exemption in 1992.

I would like to see us continue on that schedule to allow the ethanol industry to continue to build and to grow and by 1992 we will phase that exemption out and that industry will be self-sufficient and will be a major part, in my judgment, of the economic foundation of the Midwest.

Another threat that exists currently is the threat of imports, imports to the tune of 100 million, 200 million or perhaps more millions of gallons from Brazil.

I think the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Iowa and others have adequately described what the difficulty is.

I find it absolutely amazing that the Ambassador would in letters be asking questions about how do we bend the rules here? How do we bend the law so that we can move in some ethanol alcohol into the American economy duty-free and with preferred status? How do we do that?

Well, you do not do that. The reason we established these kinds of things in the U.S. Congress and in our Customs Service is that we are trying to achieve a certain kind of public policy.

□ 1940

And we have an ambassador to another country saying how can I down in this country move some of the products from this country back into my home country and bend the law in order to get it done.

I will tell you what, I am baffled and puzzled by the behavior of the Ambassador.

Well, this past weekend I was at the caucus that was held at of the Ways and Means Committee on Saturday and Sunday. Attending that caucus was the Treasury Secretary, James Baker. I had a chance to visit with the Treasury Secretary about this issue and told him of my concern and your concern about these imports, and what it would do to a domestic industry. I mean, this has the potential of devastating an important growing industry in this country.

The Treasury Secretary said well, "all we are going to do at this point is maintain contract sanctity," and I accept that. I mean, I understand the need for contract sanctity. I'm sure the gentleman in the well, Mr. DURBIN, coming from a State that is a major part of the Farm Belt, cares about contract sanctity. We have talked about it in many instances in many different ways, contract sanctity with respect to grain sales to the Soviets, contract sanctity so that we make certain that our trading partners understand that when we make an agreement to sell agricultural products to them, we are going to keep that agreement.

So I understand contract sanctity, and when the Secretary of the Treas-



ury said, "look, we are going to insist on and maintain contract sanctity with respect to the Brazilian exports to the United States," I understood that.

And once I began looking into contract sanctity on Monday, and talking to the Customs Service, I understood that the way the Customs Service looks at this is that we have the threat of seeing 175 million gallons, roughly one-third of the domestic industry production for 1 year, flooding into this country in a very short time frame under their definition of some sort of contract sanctity.

So just a couple of hours ago, I sent something down to the Treasury Department, to Jim Baker, reiterating my concern, and remembering our conversation of this weekend about contract sanctity, and asking him to look into the Customs Service interpretation of what all of that means. Contract sanctity does not mean to me that some folks get together after an August 2 date and say, "well, we were going to make a sale here, and so let us exchange some papers, and create the sale, and we will rush in a bunch of ethanol alcohol under the limit of this Customs Service regulation and avoid some of the duty." I am hoping that the Treasury Secretary in the next few days will take a close look at that and will respond to my inquiry, and I am hopeful that the Treasury Secretary will assure us that contract sanctity means what we think it means; that is, if there were written contracts, binding contracts made in good faith prior to that August 2 date, we understand that. But we do not understand the threat of 175 million gallons being thrown in here under the loosest definition of contract sanctity that I have heard of for some long while.

So those are concerns. We have a plant in Walhalla, ND, that is up and operating and working well. It takes barley that we grow in great abundance, puts it in the front end of that plant and out the back end and you get two things. You get alcohol, ethanol alcohol, and you still have the protein feed content left. I just think it makes great sense to do that with an alcohol commodity that we cannot seem to sell overseas we produce so much of it.

We do a couple of important things. First, we provide new markets for farmers who are desperately searching for new markets, and second, we extend an energy supply we need to extend in this country.

I would like to say that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], has been the consistent leader on this issue in Congress, and I appreciate that. I am going to work on this issue very hard in the Ways and Means Committee on the tax exemption issue that I talked about earlier. I am work-

ing in a number of other ways, but I give credit to these few in Congress who understand and have the vision that this industry is critically important to American agriculture that is now in trouble, and this industry is very, very important, I think, to the energy future of the United States. If we have that kind of vision, and if we make the right decisions in the months ahead, we will, I think, see 10 years from now a strong and proud ethanol alcohol industry, and we will know we made the right decision to help that industry grow and be prosperous. I just appreciate the gentleman's special order.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota.

As Congress returned this September to start the fall session, there were two major issues which we had to tackle. One was a farm bill, and we are moving with some progress on that front. The second was the issue of our trade relations with other nations around the world.

In my home State of Illinois, as I traveled about my district during the month of August, it was increasingly apparent that this was to be a year of a bumper crop. The fields have never looked better, corn and soybeans in every direction. The projections from the U.S. Department of Agriculture are that we are going to have a bumper crop of corn in the United States this year, over 8 billion bushels produced.

Can you think of what kind of welcome news that would be in other countries of the world where people starve to death for the lack of protein in their diet, all the pictures we have seen on television, but here in the United States where we should be welcoming the news of a bumper crop, many of us who live in farming areas are concerned, because a bumper crop at today's prices means that, unfortunately, prices may go down even more. And the farmers in my area of the country, and across the United States who are having a difficult time to survive look on a bumper crop as a mixed blessing, more production, but lower prices. So there is that concern.

And what we look to make up the difference with this bumper crop is more demand, and naturally more exports. Forty percent of America's agricultural production is exported. So the more we can sell overseas, the better.

But also, we look for more domestic consumption, whether we are talking about Americans eating more dairy products or whether we are talking about the sale of ethanol in the United States. We are hoping to increase the demand for this bumper crop, this production, and in so doing increase the price and the return for the American farmers.

So I came back to Washington prepared to face the difficulties of the

farm bill, in trying to take our scant resources because of our budget deficit, and apply it to a nationwide problem facing our farmers. But a few days before I returned, there was a decision, which we have referred to this evening, by the U.S. Department of the Treasury which affected not only the income that farmers could receive, but also affected the whole trade issue that is before Congress during this session. It revolves around the issue of production of ethanol, and as has been described this evening, we in the United States are blessed with a very productive domestic ethanol industry. I am proud to say that my home State of Illinois is considered the Saudi Arabia of ethanol. We produce 50 percent of all of the ethanol in the United States in my home State, within only a few miles of my home.

The significance of this industry has been stated. Some 600 million gallons of ethanol is produced each year and some 250 million bushels of corn converted into this product, and in the process, we create more demand for our products to raise our price, to help our farmers survive. And something else, we move closer to the day that we all hope for of energy independence. We do not depend on importing grain to produce ethanol. We have got it and plenty of it. And the more we can do to produce this ethanol, the better we are as a nation.

As has been mentioned, the decision by the Department of Energy to phase out the use of lead as an additive in our gasoline that we use in our automobiles creates a unique opportunity for our farm community and for the ethanol industry, because, ladies and gentlemen, we can move to the use of ethanol as an octane additive to replace lead, and in so doing help our farmers, rely on a domestic supply, and have in ethanol an environmentally safe product, all three together.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I will be happy to yield to my colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding. I compliment the gentleman's leadership in the field of attempting to discover an alternative fuel to a diminishing supply of petroleum energy throughout the world. Just in a short time that the gentleman has been here, he has recognized this national need, this preeminent national concern of discovering an alternative fuel to the declining supply of petroleum energy.

I am advised that it is virtually unanimous among all energy-knowledgeable people that the current, that the known supply of petroleum energy has been reduced by 50 percent during the last 100 years, and that during the next 50 years, maybe even as soon as

the next 30 years, the remaining known supply of petroleum products, petroleum supply will be depleted.

□ 1950

There is a commanding need in our society today to discover an alternative to petroleum. As the gentleman from Illinois has pointed out, it will do three immediate things for our Nation, in addition to making a supply of energy available.

One, it will clean up our environment. Brazil, since 1980, has reduced the poison, the lead poisoning, in its atmosphere by 75 percent, in only 5 years.

Two, alcohol fuels will reduce our dependence upon foreign oil. Last year the United States spent \$57.3 billion for its imported oil bill.

That happens to represent more than one-third of our trade deficit which is plaguing our Nation.

Finally, to revert, to change to an alcohol fuel supply will provide a market for our farm products which will bring wealth to the farm community and provide to it the infusion of economic vitality that is so lacking today.

I comment the gentleman for his leadership.

You know, the subject of alcohol fuel has been well known to modern civilization for about 50 years. I recently obtained a book from the Library of Congress, just yesterday in fact, entitled "Energy Beckons" by Hale, the author. The subject of this book is that opportunity beckons for the American people to seize alcohol fuels as an alternative to petroleum energy that will provide us with new energy as well as new income in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from taking this special order this evening, and I commend him for his leadership.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

As I mentioned in my remarks earlier, returning to Washington, I found that there has been a curious current toward the end of August, where the U.S. Department of the Treasury made a ruling, a significant ruling, one that affects not only the importation of Brazilian ethanol but affects farm income in America.

I have taken it upon myself to investigate the nature and the history of this ruling, and I would like to share it this evening and make it part of our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It begins with a letter dated July 5, 1984, which I will submit at this point for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like to quote from it.

First let me tell you it is a letter from the U.S. Ambassador to Brazil, a gentleman by the name of Diego C. Asencio. This letter from our Ambassador in Brazil to the U.S. Customs

Service, a little over a year ago, contains some interesting information. It was addressed to William Von Raab, Commissioner of the U.S. Customs Service, who still holds that position today. Let me read portions of this letter which I think are significant:

EMBASSY OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Brasilia, Brazil, July 5, 1984.

HON. WILLIAM VON RAAB,  
Commissioner, U.S. Customs Service,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR COMMISSIONER: Recently my Senior Commercial Officer, Mr. Emilio Iodice, and I met with Shegeaki Ueki, the president of the Brazilian state petroleum company Petrobras. Among the subjects we discussed was the tariff treatment of Brazilian anhydrous alcohol exported to the U.S.

Because of the lack of foreign exchange due to growing debt service requirements, Brazil has become a world leader in the substitution of fuel alcohol for gasoline in automobiles. Unfortunately (from Brazil's perspective), the very high U.S. tariffs on alcohol have greatly limited exports of Brazilian alcohol to the U.S.

As you can see from Mr. Ueki's note, Petrobras is interested in obtaining a favorable tariff ruling on the importation of anhydrous alcohol that is pre-blended with additives such as MTBE, BTX and others. According to Mr. Ueki, this product would be used as an additive to gasoline. What the Brazilians are interested in is finding some formula to export a product of alcohol, but which is different enough to qualify for a lower tariff rate.

In view of the bad news they are about to get alcohol in the Congress and from the States of California and Florida, a positive response on this subject would elicit a most positive reaction on the part of the Brazilians. It would serve somewhat to mitigate what has been considered here a growing protectionism stance on our part.

I realize that you do not normally involve yourself in details like this, but I would appreciate your help in seeing that Mr. Ueki's letter gets to the right office in Customs. After the ruling is made, I would be happy to transmit it to Mr. Ueki.

This is an example of the guidance that a future Customs Attache could provide to the Embassy.

With best wishes,  
Sincerely,

DIEGO C. ASENCIO,  
Ambassador.

Mr. Speaker, here in this letter we have the beginning of a chain of events which finally culminated on August 26, a little over a year later, in a ruling by the U.S. Department of the Treasury, and I will describe to you the impact of that ruling.

But it must be remembered as we begin this discussion this evening that it started with a letter from our Ambassador asking our Customs Service to find ways for the Brazilians to avoid paying duty on ethanol they would ship to the United States of America.

This letter, of course, was sent to the Customs Service. Within a few days it was reported that there were Brazilian exporters of ethanol who were looking to mix their ethanol with some blend

of additive, whatever it might be, to avoid paying the duty.

By September 12 of that year, the chief of the Classification Branch of the U.S. Customs Service, a Mr. Schifflin allowed this blended ethanol to come in in a duty-free status into the United States. Some 3 or 4 months later, the Treasury Department gave to our Ambassador what he requested, a means for Brazilians to ship ethanol into the United States without paying the duty.

Subsequently, through January and through the month of June in 1985, letter rulings were given to Brazilian exporters to send their products to the United States duty-free. What does it mean to send it in duty-free? Is it significant? Let me tell you how significant it is. The Brazilian ethanol industry is a state industry and heavily subsidized. They are able to produce ethanol at a much lower price than the United States because their government subsidizes their industry. Our duty is 60 cents a gallon to bring the price of their product as it comes into the United States at least at a level equal to the cost of production in the United States so as to keep our industry strong and to make up for their State subsidy. Now, if they can send in their ethanol duty-free, they stand to gain a profit of at least 60 cents a gallon on each gallon they send to the United States, a handsome profit for the exporters.

Let me tell you, the tankerships that are coming in have a capacity of between 8 and 15 million gallons. What it means is that an exporter who can get a letter ruling from the Department of the Treasury can make anywhere from \$4.8 to \$9 million every time a ship comes in, a very lucrative profit to be made. These letter rulings were made, consistently made. Those of us in Congress who felt they were inconsistent with our law in the United States requiring a duty started to protest. By August 1985, the U.S. Customs Service admitted they had made a mistake, almost a year after the first ruling they said that, "we are wrong, we should not have let that blended ethanol in, to come duty-free." Imagine the impact that has had already. They said on August 2 that they made a mistake. A lot of us breathed a sigh of relief, felt that we had won the battle. We went back to our districts for the August break to tell the farmers that the domestic ethanol industry has a chance, that we had won that battle. We were all very pleased with that result.

Then the other shoe dropped.

On August 26, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Baker, announced that because some companies had made corporate decisions in reliance on the earlier ruling which had been viewed as an incorrect ruling, but in reliance



on that ruling that he was going to open up again the possibility for Brazilian exporters who had signed contracts before August 2 of this year to ship to the United States duty-free. Therein lies the problem and the reason that we have met here this evening.

□ 2000

Because the impact of this decision is one which touches every single American citizen. Prior to Secretary Baker extending until November 2 the opportunity for the Brazilians to export, duty-free, our Secretary of Agriculture, a member of the same cabinet as Secretary Baker, sent him a letter urging him not to open the market.

Unfortunately, on August 26, Secretary Baker made that decision, and our subsequent investigation has disclosed that the Brazilians are now in a position where they can export up to 500 million gallons of ethanol, blended ethanol, into the United States duty-free before November 1, 500 million gallons. Almost 1 year's production of America's domestic ethanol industry can come in duty-free in 60 days.

What does it mean? The significance is the fact that we will lose first \$300 million we could have collected in duties. You heard the special order before; the concern about the budget deficit. Ladies and gentlemen, as we were in our districts during our work period, the Treasury Department made a decision that could deny the U.S. Treasury \$300 million that could be applied to reduce our deficit or to spend on worthwhile programs to help American citizens.

This was not a decision which was made by Congress; it was a decision made by the administration, an administration that has said from the beginning they are committed to reducing Federal spending. They cost us \$300 million; up to that amount, with that decision.

So what happens if we import 500 million gallons of ethanol? We will at least take 200 million bushels of American corn off the market that otherwise would have been used for the production of ethanol. When you take 200 million bushels of corn off the market that is not being produced into ethanol, what does it do to the price of corn? It lowers it, and the national corn growers tell us that it lowers it by 15 cents a bushel, or a net loss to American farmers of \$1.2 billion in income by this decision by our Treasury; \$1.2 billion lost farm income.

The Treasury has lost \$300 million; the farmers of America have lost \$1.2 billion; there are a lot of smiling faces among Brazilian exporters, making millions of dollars for every tanker that they bring in duty-free, and now what will happen to the 200 million bushels of corn? Our Government will

have to buy it. We will have to buy the corn that could have been produced into ethanol at an expense to our Treasury, a significant expense, for the purchase and storage of the surplus of corn which we already have.

As we debate the farm bill, we are trying to find ways to reduce Government spending on farming, while the Department of the Treasury has found a way of increasing the cost of our farm programs.

Several colleagues have joined me in asking for an investigation of this situation. We want to know who the people are and the companies are who will profit from this decision. We would like to know what motivated the administration and the Department of the Treasury to make this decision at a time when it clearly hurts American citizens across the country; in particular our farmers.

It hurts the people working in the domestic ethanol industry, and I will confess that I stand before you today with a parochial interest; I represent Decatur, IL, a town that has been hard hit by this recession; a town of high unemployment; a town that is trying to come back, and one of our major industries is ethanol; and this decision by my Government and your Government may easily cost us jobs in Decatur, IL.

Certainly people will go to work in Brazil to produce the ethanol, but they will do it at the expense of American citizens.

I have asked for an investigation because it is clear to me that the Department of the Treasury has violated our clear statutory intent to charge the 60 cents duty. It is also clear to me that when they opened it up for 90 days, they frankly opened the door to whatever the Brazilians want to send to this country.

I would also like to have it clarified as to what is the role of the U.S. Ambassador to Brazil? If he represents our country, why is he looking for ways to take money out of our Treasury? Why is he fighting for the Brazilians instead of fighting for the American citizens and companies that are affected by this decision?

Therein lies the real concern. Is this administration serving the American people, the American farmer, and the American worker? Are they truly concerned about trade issues, when on one hand the President of the United States says that he is going to take punitive action against Brazil because they will not allow us to send American computers in, and yet on the other hand reaches a decision which takes so many American jobs away, to the benefit of the Brazilians.

My colleague from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] said earlier that the Secretary of the Treasury reminded him of contract sanctity; and those of us

from farming areas are certainly sensitive to that particular element.

Contract sanctity basically says you are going to keep your word, if you enter into a contract, you are going to follow through, whether it is the United States selling grain abroad, or wherever it might be, and I suppose the Treasury Secretary is saying that if the Brazilian exporters entered into a contract to send ethanol to the United States that we should be in some way cognizant of the fact that that contract exists and respect it.

But there is another sanctity here; there is the sanctity of the law, the sanctity of the law in the United States that imposes this duty, and I wonder if the decision of the Department of the Treasury violates that sanctity.

I wonder, too, if this administration, in making this decision, has considered the impact on Decatur, IL, on Pekin, IL, on the people across this country.

We face many tough decisions in the trade area. We face many tough decisions when it comes to farming. The American farmers can never cope with the weather if the conditions go bad; they cannot control it. They can hardly cope with foreign policy and wars overseas and how it affects the demands for their product.

But little did we know in the farming areas of America that we would have to do battle with our own Government to help farm income in the United States. This battle will continue; in requesting an investigation from the House Ways and Means Committee, in also asking my colleagues to join me, in letters to Secretary Baker concerning this decision; in letters to Secretary Shultz concerning our Ambassador.

We have just begun to fight on this battle, and it is one that we have to continue for the benefit of our farmers and the people working in the ethanol industry across the United States.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentlemen from Iowa and Illinois, Mr. LEACH and Mr. DURBIN, for their leadership on the important issue of grain ethanol production and use in the United States. I want to particularly commend them for arranging this forum to specifically discuss the issue of Brazilian ethanol imports.

Many of the facts regarding this situation have already been presented. The delay in imposing the 60-cent-per-gallon duty on Brazilian blended ethanol imports could clearly cause a major disruption in domestic ethanol production, further contributing to the excess supply of corn in this country. It is estimated that the price of corn may drop by 15 cents per bushel as a result of this inordinate delay.

Let's contemplate the economic consequences of such an action. Not even considering the effect of this action on the prices of other commodities, the 15-cent price re-

duction will reduce the value of our oncoming record corn crop by \$1¼ billion. The U.S. Treasury could lose as much as \$300 million in foregone import duties on the foreign-made ethanol. Undoubtedly, more Federal outlays will be incurred to stockpile the estimated 200 million bushels of corn that will need to be warehoused, because they will not be used in ethanol production.

We are all aware that our colleagues on the Agriculture Committee have approved their version of the 1985 farm bill. We also are aware that one of the biggest struggles in the committee debate was to contain budgetary costs, while enhancing export competitiveness and protecting farmer income. It appears that the current version of the bill at least makes a substantial effort in this direction.

In view of the tight budgetary constraints faced by our Agriculture Committee colleagues and the worst economic circumstances that our farmers have faced in half a century, it only makes sense that these imports, which basically subvert the congressional intent behind our ethanol import duties, be subjected to these duties as soon as possible. I join my colleagues in calling for immediate action to place the full 60-cent-per-gallon duty on all imported ethanol, whether blended or not.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of these efforts, and to state again my full support for the American ethanol industry.

As we well know, all of agriculture is at a critical juncture. Export markets are shrinking while production potential continues to expand. In recognition of this reality, efforts are underway in my district to develop new markets to make greater use of our abundant corn harvests, and to do so right here at home. Corn growers in Minnesota have taken the lead in promoting the use of ethanol in gasoline since the 1970's. By working together with the State and Federal Government, they have successfully built a market where none existed before.

I believe a great opportunity exists to further expand on their efforts with the phase-down in lead ordered by the Environmental Protection Agency. I would hope our Government would do everything in its power to continue to expand the market for renewable fuels.

Some inside and out of the U.S. Government have suggested it would be good to allow Brazil to use ethanol sales for servicing its growing international debt. To those so concerned, I hope they will show an equal concern for our efforts in the House to help U.S. farmers obtain markets and a price to meet their debt. One way to do that will be to expand production of ethanol here at home.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to action being taken by the U.S. Customs Service and the Treasury Department that could have disastrous effects on the American farmer, the American ethanol industry, and on the United States' efforts to become independent of foreign energy sources.

In 1980, Congress imposed a duty on ethyl alcohol imports to promote the development of the domestic ethyl alcohol industry and reduce American dependency on imported petroleum. The U.S. Customs Service, in its discretion, determined that ethyl alcohol blends containing less than 60 percent ethyl alcohol would be exempt from the import duty.

Most recently, the U.S. Customs Service and the Treasury Department announced a decision exempting certain marketers and traders from the Custom Service's earlier decision to impose a 60-cent duty on blended ethanol imports. Under this decision, certain marketers and traders of blends of ethyl alcohol containing up to 97 percent foreign ethyl alcohol are exempted from the import duty.

This is a clear violation of the intent of Congress in the 1980 law. After our experience with the OPEC oil embargo, Congress saw the need to develop our domestic energy industry to lessen our dependence on foreign energy sources. The ethyl alcohol industry is well on its way toward becoming a major domestically produced source of energy. If we go forward with the Custom Service's decision, we can write off the past 5 years of work in becoming energy independent and say goodbye to the U.S. ethyl alcohol industry. It is a step backward, and it places the United States in a position where it is more vulnerable to those nations who control world energy supplies.

Perhaps more important in light of the current crisis in the agriculture economy is the effects this decision would have on the commodity market and farm income. It could allow up to 500 million gallons of imported ethyl alcohol into the United States duty free. This would mean that 200 million bushels of corn would not be converted into ethanol in the United States, in a year when the United States has a bumper crop of corn.

Adding 200 million bushels of corn to the U.S. market could drive down the price of corn 15 cents a bushel, according to the National Corn Growers Association. A direct result of that drop in the price of corn would be a \$1.2 billion drop in American farm income, during a time when the American farmer is operating with an overhead that is already higher than the return he is able to realize.

We are also faced with an immense Federal deficit. As a result of this decision by the U.S. Customs Service, the Treasury will lose \$300 million in import duties on the foreign-made ethanol. That is not to mention the added expense of purchasing and storing the surplus corn.

Furthermore, ethyl alcohol is an important part of our efforts to clean up the air we breathe. It serves as a lead-free gasoline substitute which will help move us toward our national goal of removing tetraethyl lead from gasoline. The demand for ethyl alcohol is sure to increase as the Environmental Protection Agency continues to implement its lead phaseout plan, so why not keep our domestic industry on its feet long

enough to become suppliers for this new demand?

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I believe the U.S. Customs Service should reconsider its decision on this matter. This is simply not the right time to be placing more burdens on the American farmer, the American ethanol industry, or the Federal deficit for the purpose of promoting foreign industries.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to the August 26 decision to exempt ethanol imports from the duty Congress imposed in 1980. This is another bleak example of how the administration victimizes farmers with a policy that is shortsighted and contradictory.

The ethanol industry has great potential to help us deal with the problems of huge commodity surpluses. Even with the current oil glut, ethanol is a competitive product in the energy market. As the EPA moves to phase out lead in gasoline, ethanol's role as an octane booster in fuel will become even more important. Ethanol can play a key role in the future of both our agriculture and energy industries.

Ethanol is a fledgling industry, however, and the one thing that can surely ruin it is an inconsistent Federal policy. Businesses can't survive when the rules of the game are constantly being changed. We have an ethanol plant in the district I represent, and from talking with the people at that plant, I know that they need a Federal policy they can count on if their business is going to survive.

This decision is the most recent example of a contradictory Federal farm policy that has been disastrous for rural America. The Government told farmers to plant fencepost to fencepost and then cut off their markets with embargoes. They've laid the groundwork to develop a domestic ethanol industry, and now they're helping foreign countries deal a crippling blow to that industry. It's time the administration united behind a coherent and farsighted policy that the agricultural economy can depend upon. The duty on ethanol must be reimposed immediately.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for taking the time to bring this vital issue to the floor of the House. Many farmers in my district will be adversely affected by this policy. They, as well as I, are glad to see that there are others in this body who will speak up for farmers \* \* \* America's backbone. And, as we in this body know, the strength of that backbone is being severely tested with this policy and many others embraced by this administration.

This unwarranted policy on ethanol places thousands of corn farmers in my district and throughout the Midwest in financial jeopardy. And why? So that a few marketers and traders can make millions on foreign-made ethanol. The farmers in my district have suffered enough under this administration without piling on this insensitive policy.

Just look at the numbers: 200 million bushels of corn will not be converted into



ethanol in this country under this policy; the price of corn will drop 15 cents a bushel under this policy; \$1.2 billion in farm income will be lost under this policy; and the U.S. Treasury will lose \$300 million it otherwise would have collected in import duties.

The farmers in the Ninth District of Missouri can't afford 15 cents less for a bushel of corn; my farmers can't afford fewer sales. And why should they, especially at the benefit to imports.

This is bad policy. The administration has made another mistake and those to suffer will be the farmers of America.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PURSELL (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), on account of a death in the family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. STRATTON, today for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DURBIN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HAYES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH, of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DERRICK, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROTH, following the vote on roll-call 298, in the Committee of the Whole, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, on H.R. 3244, in the Committee of the Whole, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOULTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DORNAN of California.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. WEBER.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

Mrs. JOHNSON.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. ECKERT of New York.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. BROYHILL.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. CRAIG.

Mr. MCGRATH.

Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. SHUMWAY.

Mr. RUDD.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

Mr. MCKERNAN.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

Mr. MOORE.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DURBIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SKELTON.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. GAYDOS.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. TORRES in two instances.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

Mr. FEIGHAN in three instances.

Mr. BATES.

Ms. OAKAR in three instances.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. FRANK.

Mr. BONKER.

Mr. LELAND.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. SMITH of Florida.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. DELLUMS in two instances.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. MRAZEK.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. ORTIZ.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 12, 1985, at 10 a.m.

#### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports of various House committees and delegations traveling under authorizations from the Speaker concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the fourth quarter of calendar year 1984, and the first and second quarters of calendar year 1985 in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384.

#### AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Delegation to the Far East, November 8-21, 1984:											
Delegation expenses	11/13	11/16	Korea						2,487.09		2,487.09
	11/19	11/21	Japan						48.43		48.43
Delegation to Central America, December 7-11, 1984:											
Delegation expenses	12/2	12/5	Guatemala						41.88		41.88
Committee total									2,577.40		2,577.40

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LES ASPIN, Chairman, July 31, 1985.

#### AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Visit to United Kingdom, Egypt, Kenya, Feb. 7-18, 1985:											
Aspin, Cong. Les	2/10	2/12	Egypt		180.00				12.02		192.02

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1985—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Committee total					180.00				12.02		192.02

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LES ASPIN, Chairman, July 31, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Ron Coleman	5/25	5/28	Brazil		220.25						220.25
Transportation (DOD)	5/28	5/30	Argentina		273.00						273.00
Hon. Norman Dicks	5/29	5/31	France		196.00		3,927.00				3,927.00
	5/31	6/1	Switzerland		76.00						76.00
	6/1	6/3	France		294.00		934.51				1,228.51
Transportation (DOD)							2,021.76				2,021.76
Hon. Steny Hoyer	4/8	4/9	Greece		75.00						75.00
	4/9	4/11	Egypt		174.00						174.00
	4/11	4/12	Jordan		85.00						85.00
	4/12	4/13	Syria		97.00						97.00
	4/13	4/15	Israel		266.00						266.00
	4/15	4/16	England		105.00		* 4,723.00				4,828.00
Hon. Bill Lowery	5/25	5/27	Sweden		320.00				101.03		421.03
	5/27	5/29	West Germany		150.00						150.00
	5/29	6/4	France		714.00				175.71		889.71
Transportation (DOD)							2,611.81				2,611.81
Hon. Joseph McDade	5/30	6/3	France		344.00		3,827.00				4,171.00
Hon. Matthew McHugh	4/8	4/9	Greece		75.00						75.00
	4/9	4/11	Egypt		174.00						174.00
	4/11	4/12	Jordan		85.00						85.00
	4/12	4/13	Syria		97.00						97.00
	4/13	4/15	Israel		266.00						266.00
	4/15	4/16	England		105.00		* 4,723.00				4,828.00
Hon. Robert Mrazek	4/8	4/9	Greece		75.00						75.00
	4/9	4/11	Egypt		174.00						174.00
	4/11	4/12	Jordan		85.00						85.00
	4/12	4/13	Syria		97.00						97.00
	4/13	4/15	Israel		266.00						266.00
	4/15	4/16	England		105.00		* 4,723.00				4,828.00
Hon. David Obey	4/8	4/9	Greece		75.00						75.00
	4/9	4/11	Egypt		174.00						174.00
	4/11	4/12	Jordan		85.00						85.00
	4/12	4/13	Syria		97.00						97.00
	4/13	4/15	Israel		266.00						266.00
	4/15	4/16	England		105.00		* 4,723.00				4,828.00
Hon. Eldon Rudd	4/5	4/5	Panama		150.00						150.00
	4/5	4/7	Venezuela		150.00						150.00
	4/7	4/8	Ecuador		107.00						107.00
	4/8	4/10	Panama		178.00						178.00
	4/10	4/10	Costa Rica								
	4/10	4/12	Honduras		192.00						192.00
	4/12	4/12	El Salvador								
	4/12	4/12	Belize								
Transportation (DOD)							1,737.72				1,737.72
Hon. Eldon Rudd	5/31	6/1	France		184.00						184.00
	6/1	6/2	Germany		75.00						75.00
	6/2	6/3	France		98.00		3,101.00				3,199.00
Transportation (DOD)							2,021.76				2,021.76
Hon. Martin Sabo	4/8	4/9	Greece		75.00						75.00
	4/9	4/11	Egypt		174.00						174.00
	4/11	4/12	Jordan		85.00						85.00
	4/12	4/13	Syria		97.00						97.00
	4/13	4/15	Israel		266.00						266.00
	4/15	4/16	England		105.00		* 4,723.00				4,828.00
Hon. Charles Wilson	5/26	5/30	Morocco		300.00						300.00
	5/30	6/1	Italy		212.00						212.00
	6/1	6/7	France		588.00						588.00
	6/7	6/11	Germany		300.00		* 5,360.00		355.00		6,015.00
George Allen	4/5	4/8	Saudi Arabia		486.00						486.00
	4/8	4/10	Jordan		170.00						170.00
	4/10	4/13	Egypt		261.00		4,867.00				5,128.00
	5/24	5/28	Germany		300.00						300.00
	5/28	5/30	United Kingdom		193.00						193.00
	5/30	6/3	France		344.00		3,827.00				4,171.00
Robert V. Davis	5/26	5/30	Morocco		225.00						225.00
	5/30	6/1	Italy		212.00						212.00
	6/1	6/6	France		490.00						490.00
	6/6	6/8	Switzerland		172.00		4,606.00		131.00		4,909.00
Paul Magliocchetti	6/2	6/6	France		392.00				15.18		407.18
	6/6	6/8	Switzerland		172.00		4,339.00		45.05		4,556.05
William Marinelli	5/30	6/1	France		270.00						270.00
	6/1	6/2	Germany		75.00						75.00
	6/2	6/3	France		98.00		3,101.00				3,199.00
	6/3	6/8	Greece		75.00						75.00
Terry Pell	4/8	4/9	Greece		75.00						75.00
	4/9	4/11	Egypt		174.00						174.00
	4/11	4/12	Jordan		85.00						85.00
	4/12	4/13	Syria		97.00						97.00
	4/13	4/15	Israel		266.00						266.00
	4/15	4/16	England		105.00		* 4,723.00				4,828.00
William Schuerch	4/8	4/9	Greece		75.00						75.00



## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
	4/9	4/11	Egypt		174.00						174.00
	4/11	4/12	Jordan		85.00						85.00
	4/12	4/13	Syria		97.00						97.00
	4/13	4/15	Israel		266.00						266.00
	4/15	4/16	England		105.00						105.00
Committee total					14,445.25		79,343.56		822.97		94,611.78
Investigations staff:											
Albert L. Hines	4/7	4/16	Germany		675.00		2,163.18		40.64		2,878.82
	4/16	4/17	Italy		75.00						75.00
	4/17	4/20	Spain		243.75						243.75
Roy T. Mason	4/7	4/16	Germany		675.00		2,081.70		18.80		2,775.50
	4/16	4/17	Italy		75.00						75.00
	4/17	4/20	Spain		243.75						243.75
A.M. Statham	4/8	4/23	Germany		1,143.75		2,329.00		40.52		3,513.27
	4/23	4/25	England		210.00						210.00
Joseph A. Vignali	4/8	4/23	Germany		1,143.75		2,329.00		16.32		3,489.07
	4/23	4/25	England		210.00						210.00
Committee total					4,695.00		8,902.88		116.28		13,714.16

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> DOD transportation. Cost shown is comparable first-class commercial rate.<sup>4</sup> Comprises both commercial and military transportation.

JAMIE WHITTEN, Chairman, Aug. 31, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Delegation to Central America, Apr. 5-12, 1985:											
Montgomery, Cong. G.V. (Sonny)	4/5	4/5	Panama								
	4/5	4/7	Venezuela		150.00						150.00
	4/7	4/8	Ecuador		107.00						107.00
	4/8	4/10	Panama		178.00						178.00
	4/10	4/10	Costa Rica								
	4/10	4/12	Honduras		192.00						192.00
	4/12	4/12	El Salvador								
	4/12	4/12	Belize								
Transportation: Department of the Army							1,737.72				1,737.72
Spence, Cong. Floyd	4/5	4/5	Panama								
	4/5	4/7	Venezuela		150.00						150.00
	4/7	4/8	Ecuador		107.00						107.00
	4/8	4/10	Panama		178.00						178.00
	4/10	4/10	Costa Rica								
	4/10	4/12	Honduras		192.00						192.00
	4/12	4/12	El Salvador								
	4/12	4/12	Belize								
Transportation: Department of the Army							1,627.17				1,627.17
Stump, Cong. Bob	4/5	4/5	Panama								
	4/5	4/7	Venezuela		150.00						150.00
	4/7	4/8	Ecuador		107.00						107.00
	4/8	4/10	Panama		178.00						178.00
	4/10	4/10	Costa Rica								
	4/10	4/12	Honduras		192.00						192.00
	4/12	4/12	El Salvador								
	4/12	4/12	Belize								
Refund to U.S. Treasury for 1 day per diem in Panama					(89.00)						(89.00)
Transportation: Department of the Army							1,140.92				1,140.92
Commercial transportation							876.00				876.00
Lee, Deborah R.	4/5	4/5	Panama								
	4/5	4/7	Venezuela		150.00						150.00
	4/7	4/8	Ecuador		107.00						107.00
	4/8	4/10	Panama		178.00						178.00
	4/10	1/10	Costa Rica								
	4/10	1/12	Honduras		192.00						192.00
	4/12	4/12	El Salvador								
	4/12	4/12	Belize								
Transportation: Department of the Army							1,737.72				1,737.72
Visit to Central America, Apr. 6-12, 1985:											
Skelton, Cong. Ike	4/6	4/9	Panama		267.00						267.00
	4/9	4/10	Managua		98.00						98.00
	4/10	4/12	El Salvador		300.00						300.00
Transportation: Department of the Army							5,733.33				5,733.33
Holton, Edward J.	4/6	4/9	Panama		267.00						267.00
	4/9	4/10	Managua		98.00						98.00
	4/10	4/12	El Salvador		300.00						300.00
Transportation: Department of the Army							6,647.08				6,647.08
Visit to Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland, Apr. 6-13, 1985:											
Hillis, Cong. Elwood H. (Bud)	4/7	4/11	FRG		525.00						525.00
	4/11	4/12	Switzerland						224.21		224.21
	4/12	4/13	FRG								
Commercial transportation							1,931.00				1,931.00
Visit to Federal Republic of Germany and United Kingdom, Apr. 7-13, 1985:											
Dellums, Cong. Ronald V.	4/7	4/11	FRG		220.65						220.65
Commercial transportation							2,714.11				2,714.11
Moore, Alma B.	4/7	4/11	FRG		221.03						221.03
	4/11	4/13	United Kingdom		303.78		2,423.99				2,423.99
Commercial transportation											
Eirol, Marilyn A.	4/7	4/11	FRG		253.54						253.54
	4/11	4/13	United Kingdom		296.40		2,423.99				2,423.99

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Commercial transportation											
Staff visit to Greece, Apr. 8-12, 1985:											
Lally, John F.	4/8	4/12	Greece		499.83						499.83
Commercial transportation							1,282.00				1,282.00
Preston, Colleen A.	4/8	4/12	Greece		499.83						499.83
Commercial transportation							1,282.00				1,282.00
Fleishman, William T., Jr.	4/8	4/12	Greece		499.83						499.83
Commercial transportation							1,282.00				1,282.00
Cavaola, Lawrence J.	4/8	4/12	Greece		499.83						499.83
Commercial transportation							1,282.00				1,282.00
Staff visit to Federal Republic of Germany, May 16-20, 1985:											
Schriver, Peter C.	5/16	5/20	FRG		448.00						448.00
Military transportation							4,972.04				4,972.04
Visit to Federal Republic of Germany, May 23-31, 1985:											
Darden, Cong. George (Buddy)	5/23	5/31	Germany		525.00						525.00
Commercial transportation							1,666.00				1,666.00
Delegation visit to Italy, Turkey and France, May 24-June 4, 1985:											
Price, Cong. Melvin	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							7,944.08				7,944.08
Nichols, Cong. Bill	5/30	6/4	France		595.00						595.00
Commercial transportation							1,053.00				1,053.00
Military transportation							2,021.76				2,021.76
Leath, Cong. Marvin	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							7,944.08				7,944.08
Bustamante, Cong. Albert G.	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							7,944.08				7,944.08
Dickinson, Cong. William L.	5/26	5/27	Italy		75.00						75.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							8,687.26				8,687.26
Whitehurst, Cong. G. William	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							7,944.08				7,944.08
Holt, Cong. Marjorie S.	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							7,944.00				7,944.08
Badham, Cong. Robert E.	5/29	6/4	France		714.00						714.00
Commercial transportation							1,915.00				1,915.00
Military transportation							2,021.76				2,021.76
Hillis, Cong. Elwood H. (Bud)	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							7,944.08				7,944.08
Bateman, Cong. Herbert H.	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							7,944.08				7,944.08
Blaz, Cong. Ben	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							7,944.08				7,944.08
Battista, Anthony R.	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							7,944.08				7,944.08
Bauser, Edward J.	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							7,944.08				7,944.08
Chase, Alan C.	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							7,944.08				7,944.08
Fleishman, William T.	5/30	5/4	France		595.00						595.00
Commercial transportation							1,053.00				1,053.00
Military transportation							2,021.76				2,021.76
Steffes, Peter M.	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military transportation							7,944.08				7,944.08
Delegation expenses			Italy				1,658.00				1,658.00
			Turkey				1,308.57		1,079.82		2,388.39
			France								
Visit to Brazil and Argentina, May 25-30, 1985:											
Schroeder, Cong. Patricia	5/25	5/28	Brazil		220.25						220.25
	5/28	5/30	Argentina		273.00						273.00
Military transportation							3,927.00				3,927.00
Schafer, Robert E.	5/25	5/28	Brazil		220.25						220.25
	5/28	5/30	Argentina		273.00						273.00
Military transportation							3,927.00				3,927.00
Visit to Hong Kong, May 30-June 1, 1985:											
Hopkins, Cong. Larry J.	5/30	6/1	Hong Kong, BCC		238.00						238.00
Commercial transportation							164.00				164.00
Committee total					26,057.22		165,846.14		1,304.03		193,207.39

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LES ASPIN, Chairman, July 31, 1985.



## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Walter Fauntroy.....	4/8	4/12	Haiti.....		324.00		<sup>3</sup> 423.00				747.00
Jan Shingochi.....	5/5	5/7	France.....		172.00						172.00
	5/7	5/11	Congo.....		464.00						464.00
	5/11	5/12	France.....		86.00		<sup>3</sup> 2,491.00				2,577.00
Schechter, Peter.....	5/7	5/11	Congo.....		580.00						580.00
	5/11	5/14	Senegal.....		225.00						225.00
	5/14	5/15	France.....		86.00		<sup>3</sup> 2,927.00				3,013.00
Hon. Frank Annunzio.....	5/16	5/20	Germany.....		448.00		<sup>4</sup> 6,542.15				6,990.15
Curt Prins.....	5/16	5/20	Germany.....		448.00		<sup>4</sup> 6,542.15				6,990.15
Hon. Carroll Hubbard.....	6/30	7/2	Korea.....		200.00		<sup>4</sup> 11,969.18				12,169.18
Hon. Rod Chandler.....	6/30	7/4	China.....		528.00						528.00
	7/4	7/7	Thailand.....		432.00						432.00
	7/7	7/9	Hong Kong.....		304.00		<sup>3</sup> 10,903.41				11,207.41
Committee total.....					4,297.00		41,797.89				46,094.89

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Commercial air.<sup>4</sup> Military air.

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Chairman, July 29, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Donald M. Baker.....	6/14	6/18	Switzerland.....	2,772.80	1,064.00	39	1,659.43			39	2,723.43
Rep. James M. Jeffords.....	6/18	6/20	Switzerland.....	1,782.45	228.00		1,614.44				1,842.44
Mark E. Podwin.....	6/14	6/19	Switzerland.....	1,188.35	456.00		1,481.43				1,937.43
Committee total.....					1,748.00		4,755.30				6,503.30

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, Chairman, July 22, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
MacCarthy, Mark.....	5/17	5/27	Great Britain.....		461.00		4,277.00				4,738.00
Kitzmiller, Wm. Michael.....	5/2	5/5	Haiti.....		300.00		397.00				697.00
Mounts, Gregory.....	4/13	4/15	Hong Kong.....		119.00						119.00
	4/15	4/17	Japan.....		212.00						212.00
Markey, Ed (MC).....	6/28	6/30	Switzerland.....		218.00		1,747.96				1,965.96
Paine, Christopher.....	6/28	6/30	Switzerland.....		218.00		1,680.00				1,898.00
Robbins, Anthony.....	6/27	7/1	Hungary.....		300.00		3,500.00				3,800.00
Convention fee.....								200.00			200.00
Robbins, Anthony.....	4/6	4/16	Japan.....		1,024.00		3,313.37				4,337.37
Air terminal fee.....									7.87		7.87
Rail fare in Japan.....											91.32
Local transportation.....											9.84
Stockton, Peter D.H.....	5/31	6/7	Greece.....		525.00		4,501.00				5,026.00
Fidler, Shelley.....	6/5	6/7	Canada.....		249.00		339.67				588.67
Local transportation.....							96.30				96.30
Freeman, Phyllis.....	4/6	4/16	Japan.....		1,024.00		3,313.37				4,337.37
Air terminal fee.....									7.87		7.87
Rail fare in Japan.....											91.32
Local transportation.....											9.84
Committee/START total.....					4,650.00		23,367.99		215.74		28,233.73

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN D. DINGELL, Chairman, July 31, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Abbruzzese, P.....	5/16	5/20	Germany.....		448.00						448.00
Military transportation.....							6,542.15				6,542.15
Ackerman, G.....	4/8	4/15	Israel.....		931.00		1,563.00				2,494.00
	4/15	4/16	Romania.....		123.74						123.74

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985—  
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Commercial transportation	4/16	4/17	Germany		108.00						108.00
Berdes, G.	5/18	5/23	Soviet Union		151.00		4,231.00				4,231.00
Commercial transportation	5/23	5/25	United Kingdom		200.00						151.00
Berman, H.	6/30	7/4	People's Republic of China		528.00		4,145.00				200.00
	7/4	7/7	Thailand		432.00						528.00
	7/7	7/9	Hong Kong		304.00						432.00
Military transportation							10,903.41				304.00
Total					3,225.74		27,384.56				10,903.41
Bolognese, K.	5/6	5/10	Canada		575.00						575.00
Commercial transportation							250.75				250.75
Bonker, D.	6/30	7/4	People's Republic of China		528.00						528.00
	7/4	7/7	Thailand		432.00						432.00
	7/7	7/9	Hong Kong		304.00						304.00
Military transportation							10,903.41				10,903.41
Boyer, R.	5/19	5/26	Italy		732.00						732.00
	5/26	5/29	Cyprus		324.00						324.00
	5/29	5/30	United Kingdom		151.00						151.00
Commercial transportation							4,022.00				4,022.00
Brady, J.J.	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
	6/28	7/3	Norway		655.00						655.00
	7/3	7/5	Sweden		320.00						320.00
	7/5	7/7	Denmark		228.00						228.00
Total					4,697.00		21,718.31				26,415.31
Military transportation							5,726.04				5,726.04
Bruce, T.	5/20	5/22	United Kingdom		324.00						324.00
	5/22	5/26	Italy		494.00						494.00
Commercial transportation							4,363.00				4,363.00
Bush, R.	6/29	7/6	Soviet Union		350.00						350.00
Commercial transportation							2,270.00				2,270.00
Calabia, D.	6/2	6/7	Thailand		* 540.00		2,294.00				540.00
Commercial transportation											2,294.00
Callwood, K.	4/5	4/8	Egypt		360.00				4.81		364.81
	4/8	4/13	South Africa		648.00						648.00
	4/13	4/14	Mozambique		105.00						105.00
Commercial transportation							2,619.00				2,619.00
Chambers, F.M.	4/9	4/14	Micronesia		500.00						500.00
	4/14	4/15	Philippines		113.00				11.49		124.49
Total					3,434.00		17,272.04		16.30		20,722.34
Military transportation							5,793.81				5,793.81
Crockett, G.	6/30	7/4	People's Republic of China		528.00						528.00
	7/4	7/7	Thailand		432.00						432.00
	7/7	7/9	Hong Kong		304.00						304.00
Military transportation							10,903.41				10,903.41
Curran, T.	4/9	4/13	Micronesia		* 393.00						393.00
	4/14	4/15	Philippines		113.00				11.49		124.49
Military transportation							5,793.81				5,793.81
Dorman, R.	5/25	5/26	Italy		95.00						95.00
	5/26	5/28	Malta		52.56						52.56
	5/28	5/31	Ethiopia		393.00						393.00
	5/31	6/3	Switzerland		237.00						237.00
Commercial transportation							2,520.00				2,520.00
Dymally, M.M.	7/13	7/16	United Kingdom		324.00						350.18
Commercial transportation							3,571.00				3,571.00
Total					2,871.56		28,608.21		11.49		31,491.26
Eckert, S.	6/30	7/4	People's Republic of China		528.00						528.00
	7/4	7/7	Thailand		432.00						432.00
	7/7	7/9	Hong Kong		304.00						304.00
Military transportation							10,903.41				10,903.41
Fasell, D.B.	6/28	7/3	Norway		655.00						655.00
	7/3	7/5	Sweden		320.00						320.00
	7/5	7/7	Denmark		228.00						228.00
Military transportation							5,726.04				5,726.04
Finley, M.	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
Galey, M.E.	6/16	6/18	Canada		440.50						440.50
Commercial transportation							252.02				252.02
Garcia, R.	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
Total					3,803.50		29,965.77				33,769.27
Gilman, B.A.	6/16	6/18	Canada		230.00						230.00
Military transportation							252.02				252.02
	6/30	7/2	Korea		266.00						266.00
Military transportation							13,857.81				13,857.81
Goodman, M.	6/29	7/6	Italy		896.00						896.00
Commercial transportation							2,193.00				2,193.00
Grunberg, C.A.	6/30	7/4	People's Republic of China		528.00						528.00
	7/4	7/7	Thailand		432.00						432.00
	7/7	7/9	Hong Kong		304.00						304.00
Military transportation							10,903.41				10,903.41
Hammond, B.	6/28	7/3	Norway		655.00						655.00
	7/3	7/5	Sweden		320.00						320.00
	7/5	7/7	Denmark		228.00						228.00
Military transportation							5,726.04				5,726.04
Total					3,859.00		32,932.28				36,791.28



## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Huber, R.T.	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00						216.00
	4/7	4/12	Soviet Union		305.00						305.00
	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00						324.00
Military transportation							8,529.81				8,529.81
	5/19	5/23	Soviet Union		200.00						200.00
	5/23	5/25	United Kingdom		453.00						453.00
Commercial transportation							4,145.00				4,145.00
Ingram, G.	7/3	7/8	France		786.00						786.00
Commercial transportation							1,604.81				1,604.81
Jenkins, R.M.	5/23	5/26	Italy		366.00						366.00
	5/26	5/29	Cyprus		324.00						324.00
	5/29	5/30	United Kingdom		151.00						151.00
Commercial transportation							4,022.00				4,022.00
Total					3,125.00		18,301.62				21,426.62
Jenkins, Bernadette	6/28	7/3	Norway		655.00						655.00
	7/3	7/5	Sweden		320.00						320.00
	7/5	7/7	Denmark		228.00						228.00
Military transportation							5,726.04				5,726.04
Lantos, T.	5/10	5/11	Canada		115.00						115.00
Military transportation							610.50				610.50
Levin, H.	6/28	7/2	Korea		399.00						399.00
Commercial transportation							3,616.00				3,616.00
Levine, M.	4/6	4/10	Israel		655.00						655.00
	4/10	4/11	Jordan		118.00						118.00
	4/11	4/14	Egypt		360.00				16.83		376.83
Commercial transportation							2,380.00				2,380.00
Majak, R.R.	6/30	7/4	People's Republic of China		528.00						528.00
	7/4	7/7	Thailand		432.00						432.00
	7/7	7/9	Hong Kong		304.00						304.00
Total					4,114.0		12,349.37				16,463.37
Military transportation							10,903.41				10,903.41
McBride, R.W.	4/9	4/13	Micronesia		500.00						500.00
			Philippines		113.00				11.49		124.49
Military transportation							5,793.81				5,793.81
	6/28	7/3	Norway		655.00						655.00
	7/3	7/5	Sweden		320.00						320.00
	7/5	7/7	Denmark		228.00						228.00
Military transportation							5,726.04				5,726.04
Oliver, S.	4/25	4/26	Canada		115.00						115.00
Commercial transportation							258.75				258.75
	6/4	6/9	Italy		640.00						640.00
	6/9	6/12	Switzerland		327.00						327.00
Commercial transportation							3,401.00				3,401.00
Total					2,898.00		26,083.01		11.49		28,992.50
Oliver, S.	6/28	7/3	Norway		655.00						655.00
	7/3	7/5	Sweden		320.00						320.00
	7/5	7/7	Denmark		228.00						228.00
Military transportation							5,726.04				5,726.04
Paolo, B.	5/6	5/11	Canada		575.00						575.00
Military transportation, 1 way							305.25				305.25
Commercial transportation, 1 way							125.37				125.37
Pena, R.	5/25	5/28	Brazil		220.25						220.25
	5/28	5/30	Argentina		273.00						273.00
Military transportation							6,981.33				6,981.33
Roberts, A.	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
	6/30	7/4	People's Republic of China		528.00						528.00
	7/4	7/7	Thailand		432.00						432.00
Military transportation							10,903.41				10,903.41
Total					3,679.25		30,583.55				34,262.80
Roth, S.	4/9	4/13	Micronesia		* 360.00						360.00
	4/14	4/15	Philippines		* 66.73				11.49		78.22
Military transportation							5,793.81				5,793.81
Ruebelman, T.	6/28	7/3	Norway		655.00						655.00
	7/3	7/5	Sweden		320.00						320.00
	7/5	7/7	Denmark		228.00						228.00
Military transportation							5,726.04				5,726.04
Siljander, M.	4/5	4/8	Egypt		360.00						360.00
	4/8	4/13	South Africa		648.00				4.81		652.81
	4/13	4/14	Mozambique		105.00						105.00
Commercial transportation							2,619.00				2,619.00
Slettinger, M.	6/4	6/9	Italy		640.00						640.00
	6/9	6/12	Switzerland		327.00						327.00
	6/12	6/14	Sweden		381.00						381.00
Commercial transportation							3,521.80				3,521.80
Total					4,090.73		17,660.65		16.30		21,767.68
Smith, C.H.	4/20	4/21	El Salvador		* 100.00						100.00
Commercial transportation							717.50				717.50
Smith, L.J.	5/25	5/28	Brazil		220.25						220.25
	5/28	5/30	Argentina		279.00						279.00
Commercial transportation							6,981.33				6,981.33
	6/28	7/3	Norway		655.00						655.00
	7/3	7/5	Sweden		320.00						320.00
	7/5	7/7	Denmark		228.00						228.00
Military transportation							5,726.04				5,726.04
Solarz, S.J.	4/9	4/13	Micronesia		500.00						500.00
	4/14	4/15	Philippines		113.00				11.49		124.49
Military transportation							5,793.81				5,793.81

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Total					2,415.25		19,218.68		11.49		21,645.42
	6/29	7/6	Soviet Union		350.00						350.00
	7/6	7/8	Hungary		206.00						206.00
	7/8	7/9	France		131.00						131.00
Commercial transportation							2,270.00				2,270.00
Solomon, G	4/9	4/13	Micronesia		500.00						500.00
	4/14	4/15	Philippines		113.00				11.49		124.49
Military transportation							5,793.81				5,793.81
Spalatin, I	5/19	5/23	Soviet Union		200.00						200.00
	5/23	5/25	United Kingdom		453.00						453.00
Commercial transportation							4,145.00				4,145.00
Sprunger, C	4/8	4/14	Micronesia		* 188.78						188.78
	4/14	4/15	Philippines		* 91.80				11.49		103.29
Military transportation							5,793.81				5,793.81
Total					2,233.58		18,002.62		22.98		20,259.18
Tavlarides, M	4/9	4/14	Micronesia		500.00						500.00
	4/14	4/15	Philippines		113.00				11.49		124.49
Military transportation							5,793.81				5,793.81
Commercial transportation	4/20	4/21	El Salvador		* 100.00		717.50				100.00
Torricelli, R.G	6/30	7/3	Korea		532.00						532.00
Commercial transportation							3,591.00				3,591.00
Udall, M	6/28	7/3	Norway		655.00						655.00
	7/3	7/5	Sweden		320.00						320.00
	7/5	7/7	Denmark		228.00						228.00
Military transportation							5,726.04				5,726.04
Verstandig, T.G	5/22	5/26	Italy		494.00						494.00
Commercial transportation							3,661.15				3,661.15
Total					2,942.00		19,489.50		11.49		22,442.99
Weiss, T	4/8	4/10	El Salvador		540.00						540.00
	4/10	4/13	Nicaragua				860.36				860.36
Commercial transportation											
White, J	6/30	7/4	People's Republic of China		528.00						528.00
	7/4	7/7	Thailand		432.00						432.00
	7/7	7/9	Hong Kong		304.00						304.00
Military transportation							10,903.41				10,903.41
Zschau, F	6/30	7/4	People's Republic of China		528.00						528.00
	7/4	7/7	Thailand		432.00						432.00
	7/7	7/8	Hong Kong		152.00						152.00
Military transportation, 1 way							5,451.71				5,451.71
Commercial transportation, 1 way											
Total					2,916.00		17,215.48				20,131.48
Grand total for 2d quarter											387,191.80

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Represents refund of unused per diem.

DANTE B. FASCELL, Chairman, July 30, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Sander Levin	5/10	5/10	Canada	158.13	115.00		610.50				725.50
Hon. Glenn English	5/10	5/11	El Salvador	303.75	75.00					303.75	75.00
	5/11	5/12	Honduras	192	96.00					192	96.00
	5/12	5/14	Nicaragua		184.00		5,120.00				5,304.00
Leo Jardo	5/10	5/11	El Salvador	303.75	75.00					303.75	75.00
	5/11	5/12	Honduras	192	96.00					192	96.00
	5/12	5/14	Nicaragua		184.00		5,120.00				5,304.00
Hon. Cardiss Collins	6/28	7/3	Norway		655.00						655.00
	7/3	7/8	Sweden		320.00						320.00
	7/5	7/7	Denmark		228.00						228.00
Committee total					2,028.00		16,576.54				18,604.54

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JACK BROOKS, Chairman, July 31, 1985.



## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Robert W. Kastenmeier	4/8	4/9	Europe		180.00						180.00
	4/15	4/16									
	4/9	4/11	Africa		174.00						174.00
Military air—1st class equivalent	4/11	4/15	Asia		535.00		4,723.00				5,258.00
Hon. Dave McCurdy	4/12	4/15	Central America		442.00						442.00
Military air							2,460.15				2,460.15
Hon. Bob Stump	4/12	4/15	Central America		442.00						442.00
Military air							2,460.15				2,460.15
Hon. Dick Cheney	4/12	4/15	Central America		442.00						442.00
Military air							2,460.15				2,460.15
Steven K. Berry, Staff	4/12	4/15	Central America		442.00						442.00
Military air and meals							2,460.15		32.85		2,493.00
David S. Addington, Staff	4/12	4/15	Central America		442.00						442.00
Military air and meals							2,460.15		32.85		2,493.00
Hon. Henry Hyde	4/13	4/15	Central America		346.00						346.00
Military air and meals							10,850.74		30.87		10,881.61
Hon. Bob Livingston	4/13	4/15	Central America		346.00						346.00
Military air							10,850.74				10,850.74
Delegation expenses							102.04		171.41		273.45
Hon. Dave McCurdy	5/25	5/30	South America		493.25						493.25
Military air							4,422.50				4,422.50
Delegation expenses									1,434.97		1,434.97
Committee total					4,284.25		43,249.77		1,702.95		49,236.97

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LEE H. HAMILTON, Chairman, July 22, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
John Conyers, Jr., MC	5/25	5/28	Brazil		220.25						220.25
	5/28	5/30	Argentina		273.00						273.00
Military transportation							3,927.00				3,927.00
Committee total <sup>3</sup>					493.25		3,927.00				4,420.25

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Delegation expenses will be reported by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

PETER W. RODINO, JR., Chairman.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Patricia Schroeder	5/25	5/28	Brazil		1,182.742		220.25				220.25
	5/28	5/31	Argentina		174,720		273.00				273.00
Military transportation									3,927.00		3,927.00
Andrew Feinstein	5/25	5/28	Brazil		1,182.742		220.25				220.25
	5/28	5/31	Argentina		174,720		273.00				273.00
Military transportation									3,927.00		3,927.00
Committee total					986.50		7,854.00				8,840.50

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

WILLIAM D. FORD, Chairman, July 29, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. James J. Howard	5/29	6/2	Ireland		426.00				478.75		904.75
	6/2	6/4	France		393.00				75.52		468.52
Commercial air transportation							1,509.00				1,509.00
Military air transportation							1,304.11				1,304.11
Hon. Robert A. Roe	5/29	6/2	Ireland		426.00				478.75		904.75
	6/2	6/4	France		393.00				75.51		468.51
Commercial air transportation							1,509.00				1,509.00
Military air transportation							1,304.11				1,304.11
Hon. Bud Shuster	5/24	5/27	England		354.00						354.00

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
	5/27	5/30	Germany		225.00						454.03
	5/30	6/3	France		476.00		2,538.00		229.03		3,014.00
Total					2,693.00		8,164.22		1,337.56		12,194.78
Hon. William O. Lipinski	5/24	5/27	Italy		225.00						225.00
	5/27	5/31	Turkey		432.00						432.00
	5/31	6/4	France		476.00						476.00
Military air transportation							7,944.08				7,944.00
Hon. Thomas E. Petri	4/8	4/9	Greece		75.00						75.00
	4/9	4/11	Egypt		174.00						174.00
	4/11	4/12	Jordan		85.00						85.00
	4/12	4/13	Syria		97.00						97.00
	4/13	4/15	Israel		266.00						266.00
	4/15	4/16	England		105.00						105.00
Military air transportation							4,723.00				4,723.00
Total					1,935.00		12,667.08				14,602.08

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES J. HOWARD, Chairman, July 30, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Sensenbrenner	4/5	4/4	United States				4,171.00				4,171.00
	4/5	4/10	Brazil	1,512.79	335.43					1,512.79	335.43
	4/10	4/12	Uruguay	9,828	108.00					9,828	108.00
	4/12	4/15	Argentina	177,000.00	354.00					177,000	354.00
	4/16		United States								
Gordon	4/5	4/4	United States				4,073.00				4,073.00
	4/5	4/10	Brazil	1,873.18	415.34					1,873.18	415.34
	4/10	4/12	Uruguay	9,828	108.00					9,828	108.00
	4/12	4/15	Argentina	177,000	354.00					177,000	354.00
	4/16		United States								
Boucher <sup>a</sup>	5/25	5/25	United States				3,927.00				3,927.00
	5/25	5/28	Brazil		220.25						220.25
	5/28	5/30	Argentina		273.00						273.00
	5/30		United States								
Trippett	5/28	5/27	United States				1,603.00				1,603.00
	5/28	5/30	Switzerland	376.50	175.00				595.00	376.50	770.00
	5/30	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States								
Fuqua	5/24	5/24	United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States								
Lujan	5/25	5/24	United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States								
Volkmer	5/25	5/24	United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States								
Nelson	5/26	5/23	United States <sup>a</sup>								
	5/26	5/29	Germany	693	225.00					693	225.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States				1,304.11				1,304.11
Young	5/24	5/24	United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States								
Mineta	5/25	5/24	United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States								
Packard	5/25	5/24	United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States								
Hicks, Jr.	5/25	5/24	United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States								
Ketcham	5/25	5/24	United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States								
Freiwald	5/24	5/24	United States				2,712.55				2,712.55



## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Tate	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
Dugan	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
Taylor	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
Branscome	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
Holmfeld	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
Irwin	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
Mathis	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
Smith	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
Clement	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	5/31	Paris	2,237.20	238.00				75.30	2,237.20	313.30
	5/31		United States				554.87				554.87
Thompson	5/25	5/27	Sweden	2,848	320.00				101.03	2,848	421.03
	5/27	5/29	Germany	462	150.00					462	150.00
	5/29	6/4	Paris	6,711.60	714.00				175.71	6,711.60	889.71
	6/4		United States				2,712.55				2,712.55
Committee total					26,016.02		65,867.32		6,104.07		97,987.41

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Delegation expenses reported by the Intelligence Committee.<sup>4</sup> Traveling with the Air Force—"Quick Look" Program.

DON FUQUA, Chairman, July 29, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Bill Hendon	4/5	4/5	Panama								
	4/5	4/7	Venezuela	1,963.50	150.00						150.00
	4/7	4/8	Ecuador	12,393.80	107.00						107.00
	4/8	4/10	Panama		178.00						178.00
	4/10	4/10	Costa Rica								
	4/10	4/12	Honduras	384	192.00						192.00
	4/12	4/12	El Salvador								
Department of Army transportation							1,737.72				
Total					627.00		1,737.72				2,364.72
Nancy Sullivan	4/5	4/5	Panama								
	4/5	4/7	Venezuela	1,963.50	150.00						150.00
	4/7	4/8	Ecuador	12,393.80	107.00						107.00
	4/8	4/10	Panama		178.00						178.00
	4/10	4/10	Costa Rica								
	4/10	4/12	Honduras	384	192.00						192.00
	4/12	4/12	El Salvador								
Department of Army transportation							1,737.72				1,737.72
Total					627.00		1,737.72				2,364.72
Hon. Sam B. Hall	4/5	4/5	Panama								

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1985—  
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
	4/5	4/5	Venezuela		1,963.50		150.00				150.00
	4/7	4/8	Ecuador		12,393.80		107.00				107.00
	4/8	4/10	Panama				178.00				178.00
	4/10	4/10	Costa Rica								
	4/10	4/12	Honduras		384		192.00				192.00
	4/12	4/12	El Salvador								
	4/12	4/12	Belize								
Department of Army transportation								1,627.17			1,627.17
Total					627.00		1,627.17				2,254.34

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

G.V. MONTGOMERY, Chairman, July 25, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO IRELAND, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 6 AND 18, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Edward P. Boland	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Joseph M. McDade	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
John P. Murtha	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Edward R. Madigan	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Joseph D. Early	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Brian J. Donnelly	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Pat Williams	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Barbara B. Kennelly	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Bill Lowery	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Raymond J. McGrath	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Dr. Freeman Carey	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Kirk O'Donnell	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
James Ferguson	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Kevin Peterson	3/6	3/18	Ireland		1,536.00		4,244.51				5,780.51
Christine Sullivan	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Donn Anderson	3/13	3/18	Ireland		634.00		6,400.41				7,034.41
Committee total					11,680.00		106,651.07				118,331.07

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., Apr. 16, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, CHARLES MELLODY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 24 AND MAR. 1, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Charles Melody	2/25	2/27	Germany		225.00						225.00
	2/27	3/1	Spain		150.00						150.00
							1,544.00				1,544.00
Committee total					375.00		1,544.00				1,919.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHARLES MELLODY, Apr. 26, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO PORTUGAL, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 28 AND 31, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Brooks, Jack	3/28	3/31	Portugal	56.052	324.00						324.00
Military air								6,885.00			6,885.00
Brady, John J.	3/28		Portugal	56.052	324.00						324.00
Military air								6,885.00			6,885.00
Abbruzzese, P.A.	3/28		Portugal	56.052	324.00						324.00
Military air								6,885.00			6,885.00
Committee total					972.00			20,655.00			21,627.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JACK BROOKS, Apr. 18, 1985.



## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, SOVIET UNION AND SPAIN, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 4 AND 15, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Dan Rostenkowski	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Robert Michel	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Silvio Conte	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Delbert Latta	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. John Murtha	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Marty Russo	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Ralph Regula	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. George Miller	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Joseph McDade	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Norman Sisisky	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Frank Guarini	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Dr. Freeman Carey	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Ambassador Philip Kaiser	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Kirk O'Donnell	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Charles Melody	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
William Pitts	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Nancy Panzke	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Donn Anderson	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Charles Wollerton	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Eleanor Kelley	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Robert Huber	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Total					4,968.00				4,705.12		9,673.00
Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Dan Rostenkowski	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Robert Michel	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Silvio Conte	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Delbert Latta	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. John Murtha	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Marty Russo	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Ralph Regula	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. George Miller	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Joseph McDade	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Norman Sisisky	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Frank Guarini	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Dr. Freeman Carey	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Ambassador Philip Kaiser	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Kirk O'Donnell	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Charles Melody	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
William Pitts	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Nancy Panzke	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Donn Anderson	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Charles Wollerton	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Eleanor Kelley	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Robert Huber	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Total					14,030.00				5,345.00		19,375.00
Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Dan Rostenkowski	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Robert Michel	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Silvio Conte	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Delbert Latta	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. John Murtha	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Marty Russo	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Ralph Regula	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. George Miller	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Joseph McDade	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Norman Sisisky	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Frank Guarini	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Dr. Freeman Carey	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Ambassador Philip Kaiser	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Kirk O'Donnell	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Charles Melody	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
William Pitts	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Nancy Panzke	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Donn Anderson	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Charles Wollerton	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Eleanor Kelley	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Robert Huber	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Total					7,452.00				6,466.31		13,918.31

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., July 17, 1985.

## AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, SOVIET UNION, AND SPAIN, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 4 AND 15, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Dan Rostenkowski	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Robert Michel	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Silvio Conte	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, SOVIET UNION, AND SPAIN, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 4 AND 15, 1985—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Delbert Latta	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. John Murtha	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Marty Russo	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Ralph Regula	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. George Miller	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Joseph McDade	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Norman Sisisky	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Hon. Frank Guarini	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Dr. Freeman Carey	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Ambassador Philip Kaiser	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Kirk O'Donnell	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Charles Melody	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
William Pitts	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Nancy Panzke	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Donn Anderson	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Charles Wollerton	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Eleanor Kelley	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Robert Huber	4/5	4/7	Federal Republic of Germany		216.00				204.57		420.57
Total					4,968.00				4,705.12		9,673.00
Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Dan Rostenkowski	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Robert Michel	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Silvio Conte	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Delbert Latta	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. John Murtha	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Marty Russo	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Ralph Regula	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. George Miller	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Joseph McDade	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Norman Sisisky	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Hon. Frank Guarini	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Dr. Freeman Carey	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Ambassador Philip Kaiser	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Kirk O'Donnell	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Charles Melody	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
William Pitts	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Nancy Panzke	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Donn Anderson	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Charles Wollerton	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Eleanor Kelley	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Robert Huber	4/7	4/12	U.S.S.R.		610.00				232.39		842.39
Total					14,030.00				5,345.00		19,375.00
Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Dan Rostenkowski	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Robert Michel	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Silvio Conte	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Delbert Latta	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. John Murtha	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Marty Russo	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Ralph Regula	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. George Miller	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Joseph McDade	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Norman Sisisky	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Hon. Frank Guarini	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Dr. Freeman Carey	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Ambassador Philip Kaiser	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Kirk O'Donnell	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Charles Melody	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
William Pitts	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Nancy Panzke	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Donn Anderson	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Charles Wollerton	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Eleanor Kelley	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Robert Huber	4/12	4/15	Spain		324.00				281.14		605.14
Total					7,452.00				6,466.31		13,918.31

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., July 17, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO SWEDEN, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 10 AND 14, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Patricia Schroeder	4/10	4/13	Sweden		366.00						366.00
Claudine Schneider	4/10	4/13	Sweden		366.00						366.00
Barbara Boxer	4/10	4/14	Sweden		488.00						488.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

PAT SCHROEDER, May 22, 1985.



## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JEFFREY R. PIKE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 3 AND 5, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Jeffrey R. Pike	5/3	5/5	Canada	323.77			515.10			323.77	515.10

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JEFFREY R. PIKE, May 5, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NICARAGUA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 3 AND 6, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. George Miller	5/3	5/6	Nicaragua		322.27		5,633.76				5956.03
Hon. David Bonior	5/3	5/6	Nicaragua		322.27		5,633.76				5956.03
Steven Champlin	5/3	5/6	Nicaragua		322.27		5,633.76				5956.03
Cynthia Annson	5/3	5/6	Nicaragua		322.27		5,633.76				5956.03
Committee total					1,289.08		22,535.04				23,824.12

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

GEORGE MILLER, June 6, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 17 AND 20, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Frank Annunzio	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
Hon. Robert Badham	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
Hon. Jack Brooks	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
Hon. Sala Burton	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
Hon. Frank Horton	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
B. Larson	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
R. Lasch	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
Total					3,584.00		52,337.20				55,921.20
Hon. George O'Brien	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
C. Prins	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
Hon. Charles Rose	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
Hon. Samuel Stratton	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
Hon. William Whitehurst	5/16	5/20	Germany		448.00						448.00
Military air transportation							6,542.15				6,542.15
Total					2,240.00		32,710.75				34,950.75

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHARLIE ROSE, June 27, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NORWAY, SWEDEN, AND DENMARK, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 28 AND JULY 7, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
R. Lasch	6/28	7/3	Norway		655.00						655.00
	7/3	7/5	Sweden		320.00						320.00
	7/5	7/7	Denmark		228.00						228.00
Military transportation							5,726.04				5,726.04
Debra Cabral	6/28	7/3	Norway		655.00						655.00
	7/3	7/5	Sweden		320.00						320.00
	7/5	7/7	Denmark		228.00						228.00
Military transportation							5,726.04				5,726.04
Total					2,406.00		11,452.08				13,858.08

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RONALD LASCH, Aug. 5, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DR. JAMES D. FORD, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 30 AND JULY 7, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Dr. James D. Ford	6/30	7/1	West Germany	342.72	112.00		<sup>3</sup> 1,739.00				1,851.00
	7/1	7/5	England	225.5	284.00		160.00				444.00
	7/5	7/7	Ireland	237.57	246.00		<sup>3</sup> 1,563.00				1,809.00
Total					642.00		2,362.00				4,107.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Via military transportation. Amount reflects first class equivalent air fares.

JAMES D. FORD, Aug. 6, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MARY-ALYCE JONES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 30 AND JULY 7, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Mary-Alyce F. Jones	6/30	7/2	Germany	685.60	112.00						112.00
	7/2	7/4	Italy	514.536	132.00						132.00
	7/4	7/5	Germany		37.50						37.50
	7/5	7/7	France	2,436.60	131.00						131.00
Military air transport							4054.60				
Committee total					411.50		4054.60				4,466.10

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MARY-ALYCE F. JONES, Aug. 2, 1985.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. JIM MOODY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 7 AND 8, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Jim Moody	7/7	7/8	Switzerland	200.97	79.00	2,083.20	818.91			2,283.97	897.91

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JIM MOODY, Aug. 12, 1985.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1972. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting notice that the award of a contract has been authorized without full and open competition while benefiting the public interest, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(c)(7); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1973. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1974. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting the report of political contributions for Malcolm R. Wilkey, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1975. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting the report of political contributions for Robert Houdek, of Illinois, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, as Ambassador to Uganda, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1976. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting the report of political contributions for Natale H. Bellocchi, of New York, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, as Ambassador to the Republic of Botswana, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1977. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting the report of political contributions for Patricia Mary Byrne, of Ohio, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Deputy Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1978. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting the report of political contributions for Roger Kirk, of the District of Columbia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister, as Ambassador to the Socialist Republic of Romania, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1979. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting the report of political contributions for Michael Stirrhos, of the District of Columbia, as Ambassador to Jamaica, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1980. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting the report of political contributions for Jean B. S. Gerard, of New York, as Ambassador to Luxembourg, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1981. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting the report of political contributions for Clyde D. Taylor, of Maryland, a Minister-Counselor,



as Ambassador to the Republic of Paraguay, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1982. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management Operations, Department of the Interior, transmitting proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in Outer Continental Shelf areas, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1953, chapter 345, section 10(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1983. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management Operations, Department of the Interior, transmitting proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in Outer Continental Shelf areas, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1953, chapter 345, section 10(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1984. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management Operations, Department of the Interior, transmitting proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in Outer Continental Shelf areas, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1953, chapter 345, section 10(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1985. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a copy of the fiscal year 1987 budget request as submitted by OMB, pursuant to Public Law 92-225 section 307 (d)(1) (93 Stat. 1354, 1356); jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Appropriations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 3128. A bill to make changes in spending and revenue provisions for purposes of deficit reduction and program improvement, consistent with the budget process; with amendments (Rept. 99-241 Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3128. A bill to make changes in spending and revenue provisions for purposes of deficit reduction and program improvement, consistent with the budget process; with an amendment (Rept. 99-241, Pt. 3). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 262. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7, a bill to extend and improve the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (Rept. 99-263). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 263. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2266, a bill authorizing appropriations for Amtrak for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, establishing a commission to study the financial status of Amtrak, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-264). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. A bill H.R. 3101 to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for budget reconciliation, and improvements, with respect to the medicare and medicaid program; with an amendment (Rept. 99-265). Pt. 1 Ordered to be printed.

#### SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3128; H.R. 3128 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 3261. A bill to commemorate the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States with exhibits and programs relating to the history of democracy and by the establishment of Democracy Hall; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. BENTLEY:

H.R. 3262. A bill entitled Passenger Ship Authorization Act: to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr.

FORD of Michigan, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PENNY, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FROST, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 3263. A bill to establish a Federal program to strengthen and improve the capability of State and local educational agencies and private nonprofit schools to identify gifted and talented children and youth and to provide those children and youth with appropriate educational opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 3264. A bill to amend section 607 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to ensure consistent use of funds made available for capital construction of vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BONKER (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. GLICKMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. WILSON):

H.R. 3265. A bill to establish as an executive department of the U.S. Government a Department of Commerce and Trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. COELHO:

H.R. 3266. A bill to declare certain lands in the city of Coalinga, CA, abandoned by the Southern Pacific Transportation Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3267. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for general revenue sharing for 7 years; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DiOGUARDI (for himself, Mr. MONSON and Mr. COBEY):

H.R. 3268. A bill to provide a separate appropriation for all congressional foreign travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ERDREICH:

H.R. 3269. A bill to amend the Unfair Competition Act of 1916 and Clayton Act to provide for further relief in the event of unfair foreign competition; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 3270. A bill to reestablish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to authorize such Corporation to perform its traditional lending functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 3271. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude the employees of States and political subdivisions of States from the provisions of that act relating to maximum hours, to clarify the application of that act to volunteers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. LENT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. HUGHES):

H.R. 3272. A bill to designate the shipwreck of the Titanic as a maritime memorial and to provide for reasonable research, exploration and, if appropriate, salvage activities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. HENDON, and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota):

H.R. 3273. A bill to amend title XI of the Education Amendments of 1978, relating to Indian Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEACH of Iowa (for himself and Mr. LIGHTFOOT):

H.R. 3274. A bill to provide emergency measures to solve the credit crisis confronting the agricultural economy of the United States and ensure the future availability of credit for rural America, to abolish the Farm Credit Administration and establish the Emergency Farm Credit Authority within the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LELAND:

H.R. 3275. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to eligible State and local governments to support projects for education and information dissemination concerning Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, and to make grants to State and local governments for the establishment of programs to test blood to detect the presence of antibodies to the human T-cell lymphotropic virus; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 3276. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt from the overtime requirements of that Act employees of State and local public agencies and to clarify the application of that act to volunteers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 3277. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist in railroad disaster reconstruction efforts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. OAKAR:

H.R. 3278. A bill to require certain banks, savings banks, and savings and loan institutions to obtain Federal deposit insurance; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SHUMWAY:

H.R. 3279. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire:

H.R. 3280. A bill to require a separate appropriation for all congressional foreign travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3281. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that services provided by a clinical psychologist in a rural health clinic need not be provided under the direct supervision of a physician in order to qualify for payment under the Medicare and Medicaid programs; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce.

Mr. Mr. STAGGERS (for himself, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 3282. A bill to amend chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for educational assistance for apprenticeship or other on job training under the new GI bill educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAUZIN:

H.R. 3283. A bill amending the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prevent the use of Outer Continental Shelf facilities for the purpose of receiving supplies or cargo from foreign ports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMAS of Georgia:

H.R. 3284. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to make changes in the judicial divisions in the Southern District of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 3289. A bill to establish the Office of the Director of National and International Drug Operations and Policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 380. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Appropriations.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.J. Res. 381. Joint resolution designating March 25 1986, and every March 25 thereafter, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PASHAYAN:

H.J. Res. 382. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STARK:

H.J. Res. 383. Joint resolution to require the General Services Administration to hold an annual meeting of the Information Resources Managers of the various Federal Agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 384. Joint resolution designating September 22, 1985, as "Farm Aid Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARNES (for himself and Mr. LAGOMARSINO):

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution condemning the kidnaping of Ines Gaudelupe Duarte Duran, daughter of President Jose Napoleon Duarte of El Salvador; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARNES:

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of the Congress for an early and peaceful return of democratic rule in Chile; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should seek the support of other nations for the establishment of an International Office of Diplomatic Security within the Secretariat of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H. Res. 262. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7), to extend and improve the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; House Calendar No. 64. House Report No. 99-263.

H. Res. 263. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2266) authorizing appropriations for Amtrak for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, establishing a commission to study the financial status of Amtrak, and for other purposes; House Calendar No. 65. House Report No. 99-264.

By Mr. ROTH:

H. Res. 264. Resolution regarding small business and agriculture representation on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 3285. A bill to clear certain impediments to the licensing of a vessel for employment in the coastwise and fisheries trade in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DEWINE:

H.R. 3286. A bill for the relief of Norman Raymond Lee; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 3287. A bill for the relief of Melissa Johnson and Barbara Johnson Lizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 3288. A bill for the relief of Janet and Michael Nerone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. DAUB.

H.R. 43: Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 161: Mr. BORSKI and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 230: Mr. HAWKINS.

H.R. 480: Mr. SUNIA.

H.R. 585: Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 825: Mr. FRANK, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BROSKI, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. REID, and Mr. WEBER.

H.R. 864: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 917: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 983: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HOWARD, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 1019: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1021: Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 1059: Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. WALKER, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BARNES.

H.R. 1287: Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1385: Mr. IRELAND.

H.R. 1398: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1550: Mr. HOWARD and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1613: Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 1626: Mr. SHARP, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. SILJANDER.

H.R. 1674: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1770: Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 1840: Mr. GREGG, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1918: Mr. OWENS and Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

H.R. 1950: Mr. WALGREN, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 1965: Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 2025: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2132: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2156: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 2164: Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 2185: Mr. DAUB, and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 2222: Mr. BARTON, of Texas, Mr. LOTT, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. KINPNESS, Mr. HILER, Mr. COATS, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. MACK, and Mr. DEWINE.

H.R. 2257: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 2361: Mr. GREEN and Mr. UDALL.

H.R. 2396: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2481: Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 2489: Mr. JONES of Tennessee and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 2526: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 2539: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. COBEY, and Mr. SUNIA.

H.R. 2580: Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. OLIN, Mr. SABO, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 2591: Mr. FISH, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 2602: Mr. GRAY, of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2632: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 2659: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 2663: Mr. DASCHLE and Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 2685: Mr. OWENS and Mr. MARTINEZ.



H.R. 2708: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. LOTT.

H.R. 2741: Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 2761: Mr. HOWARD, Mr. DYSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 2782: Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FISH, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 2783: Mr. SWIFT, Mr. LUKE, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 2795: Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MONSON, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LOEFFLER, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 2851: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2854: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 2936: Mrs. HOLT and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 2950: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. CARPER, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2957: Mr. WEISS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2958: Mr. WEISS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2973: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 2983: Mr. PURSELL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. SILJANDER.

H.R. 3026: Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 3035: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 3041: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.R. 3042: Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3050: Mr. COBEY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DANIEL, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3058: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3066: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 3099: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WEISS, Mr. BATES, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LELAND, Mr. ROE, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 3126: Ms. OAKAR and Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 3129: Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. BYRON, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 3132: Mr. ROBINO, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. MANTON, Mr. YATES, Mr. DIXON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GREEN, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. BARNES.

H.R. 3147: Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 3220: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3230: Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. WEBER, Mr. RUDD, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 3235: Mr. LUJAN.

H.R. 3237: Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUDD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. WEBER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DAUB, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. RALPH M. HALL.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut.

H.J. Res. 126: Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. GREGG.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. NELSON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 171: Mr. BREAUX, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. McHUGH.

H.J. Res. 178: Mr. YOUNG of Missouri and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 221: Mr. HOYER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. MOORE.

H.J. Res. 234: Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. PEPPER, and Mrs. HOLT.

H.J. Res. 254: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LUKE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. LENT, Mr. BARNARD, and Mr. SCHUMER.

H.J. Res. 267: Mr. WILSON.

H.J. Res. 271: Mr. STARK, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. COELHO, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. PUQUA, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. SYNAR.

H.J. Res. 284: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. DAUB, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.J. Res. 287: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LENT, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PASHAYAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. ST GERMAIN.

H.J. Res. 292: Mr. ROSE, Mr. BROTHILL, Mr. ADDABO, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MANTON.

H.J. Res. 296: Mr. NICHOLS and Mr. HAYES.

H.J. Res. 297: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. WEBER, Mrs. MEYERS OF KANSAS, Mr. HENRY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ECKERT of New York, and Mr. McHUGH.

H.J. Res. 322: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BROTHILL, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. TAUKE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. WIRTH.

H.J. Res. 324: Mr. DEWINE and Mr. COBEY.

H.J. Res. 326: Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. BROTHILL, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. TORRES, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. HUCKABY.

H.J. Res. 333: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. SABO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FISH, Mr. HAYES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. GALLO, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BROTHILL, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.J. Res. 336: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. WALGREEN, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MINETA, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. CONTE, Mr. BATES, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. OWENS.

H.J. Res. 356: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. FEIGHAN.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. CONTE.

H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. DANIEL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. JONES of Oklahoma.

H. Res. 12: Mr. MARKEY.

H. Res. 188: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. MATSUI.

H. Res. 194: Mr. SCHUMER.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

202. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city of Eden Prairie, Hennepin County, MN, relative to the Baha'i community; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2266

By Mr. EVANS of Illinois:

—At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 11. EMPLOYMENT VACANCY FILING.

(a) LIABILITY.—Section 704(c) of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (45 U.S.C. 797(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "VACANCY NOTICES.—"; and

(2) by adding at the end a new paragraph as follows:

"(2)(A) As soon as the Board becomes aware of any failure on the part of a railroad to comply with paragraph (1), the Board shall issue a warning to such railroad of its potential liability under subparagraph (B).

"(B) Any railroad failing to comply with paragraph (1) of this subsection after being warned by the Board under subparagraph (A) shall be liable for a civil penalty in the amount of \$1,000 for each vacancy with re-

spect to which such railroad has so failed to comply."

(b) **EXTENSION.**—Section 704(f) of such Act (45 U.S.C. 797c(f)) is amended by striking out "4-year" and inserting in lieu thereof "6-year".

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATES.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and the amendment made by subsection (b) shall be effective as of August 1, 1985.

By Mr. FOLEY:

—At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

#### SEC. 11. RAIL EMPLOYEE TAXES.

Section 11504(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) No part of the compensation paid by a rail carrier providing transportation subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission under subchapter I of chapter 105 of this title to an employee who performs his regular assigned duties as such an employee on a railroad in more than one State, shall be subject to the income tax laws of any State or subdivision thereof other than a State or subdivision thereof described in paragraph (2) of this subsection."

#### H.R. 7,

By Mr. BARTLETT:

—Page 7, after line 24, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

#### SEC. 12. ELIMINATION OF ASSISTANCE FOR NON-NEEDY CHILDREN UNDER THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT AND THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966.

(a) **ELIMINATION OF CASH ASSISTANCE FOR NON-NEEDY CHILDREN IN THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH AND SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAMS.**—

(1) Section 11(a) of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2)(A) The special assistance factor prescribed by the Secretary for free lunches shall be 132.50 cents. The special assistance factor for reduced-price lunches shall be 40 cents less than the special assistance factor for free lunches.

"(B) A two-cent supplemental payment shall be made for each free and reduced price lunch served in a school food authority which, in school year 1984-1985 received a two-cent supplemental payment under this section for each free and reduced price lunch served in the program."

(B) in paragraph (3)(A) by—

(i) striking clause (i); and

(ii) redesignating clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) as (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively.

(2) The first sentence of section 14(f) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking "national average payment" and inserting in lieu thereof "special assistance factor".

(3)(A) Section 11 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "APPORTIONMENT TO STATES".

(B) Section 4 of the National School Lunch Act is repealed and section 11 of the

National School Lunch Act (as amended by this section) is redesignated as section 4.

(4) Section 6(a)(2) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking "section 4 of this Act and the amount appropriated pursuant to sections 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4".

(5) Section 7 of the National School Lunch Act is amended in the first sentence of subsection (a)(1) by striking out "agricultural commodities and other foods" and inserting in lieu thereof "food and providing meals".

(6) Section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1)(A)—

(i) by inserting in clause (i) "free or at a reduced price" after "breakfasts served";

(ii) in clause (ii) by striking out ", for reduced-price breakfasts, or for breakfasts served to children not eligible for free or reduced-price meals," and inserting in lieu thereof "or for reduced-price breakfasts,"; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1)(B), by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(7) Section 8 of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(A) in the second sentence by striking out "agricultural commodities and other foods" and inserting in lieu thereof "foods and provide meals";

(B) in the next to the last sentence, by striking out "national average" and inserting "special assistance"; and

(C) in the last sentence, by striking out "section 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4".

(8) Section 4(d) of the National School Lunch Act, (as redesignated by this section) is amended by striking out "including those applicable to funds apportioned or paid pursuant to section 4 but excluding the provisions of section 7 relating to matching,".

(9) Section 12(f) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out "national average payment rates prescribed under sections 4 and 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "payments prescribed under section 4".

(b) **ELIMINATION OF CASH ASSISTANCE FOR NON-NEEDY CHILDREN IN THE CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM.**—

(1) Section 17 of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(A) by amending subsections (c)(1), (2), and (3) to read as follows:

"(c)(1) For purposes of this section, the payment rate for free lunches and suppers and the payment rate for reduced-price lunches and suppers shall be the same as the payment rates for free lunches and reduced-price lunches under section 4 of this Act (as adjusted pursuant to section 4(a) of this Act).

"(2) For purposes of this section, the payment rate for free breakfasts and the payment rate for reduced-price breakfasts shall be the same as the national average payment rates for free breakfasts and reduced-price breakfasts respectively, under section 4(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (adjusted pursuant to section 4(a) of this Act).

"(3) For purposes of this section, the payment rate for free supplements shall be that in effect on September 30, 1985 and the pay-

ment rate for reduced-price supplements shall by one-half the rate for free supplements (adjusted pursuant to section 4(a) of this Act); and

(B) in subsection (f)(3)(A) by striking out ", except that reimbursement shall not be provided under this subparagraph for meals or supplements served to the children of a person acting as a family or group day care home provider unless such children" and inserting in lieu thereof ". Reimbursements shall be provided under this subparagraph only for meals and supplements served to children who".

—Page 3, strike out line 17 and all that follows through line 10 on page 4.

—Page 7, after line 24, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

#### SEC. 12. SIMPLIFICATION OF PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.

The National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

##### "SIMPLIFICATION OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS

"Sec. 25. The Secretary shall conduct an analysis of program requirements under this Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to identify program changes that would simplify program operations at the local level. Within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report the results of such analysis, together with any recommendations or proposals for legislation, to the appropriate committees of the Congress."

—Page 5, after line 22, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

#### SEC. 9. ELIMINATION OF 1986 ADJUSTMENT TO REIMBURSEMENT RATES IN THE SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

(a) **SPECIAL ASSISTANCE.**—Section 11(a) of the National School Lunch Act is amended in paragraph (3)(A) by striking out "July 1, 1982" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1987".

(b) **CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM.**—Section 17 of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(3)(A) by striking out "July 1 of each year" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1987 and each subsequent July 1"; and

(2) in subsection (f)(3)(B), by striking out "July 1 of each year" and inserting "July 1, 1987 and each subsequent July 1".

(c) **SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN.**—Section 13(b) of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking out "each January 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "on January 1, 1987 and each subsequent January 1"; and

(2) by inserting at the end of paragraph (4)(B) the following sentence: "Such rates should not be adjusted to reflect changes in costs or prices during the period January 1, 1985 through January 1, 1986."

(d) **SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.**—Section 4(b)(2)(B)(ii) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by adding a new sentence at the end thereof as follows: "No such annual adjustment shall be made July 1, 1986."